

SRI VENKATESWARA UNIVERSITY

ORIENTAL JOURNAL



Volume : XXXVII

January - December 1994

Parts : 1 & 2

ISSN 0081 - 3007

**SRI VENKATESWARA UNIVERSITY
ORIENTAL JOURNAL**

Volume XXXVII: 1994



**ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE
SRI VENKATESWARA UNIVERSITY
TIRUPATI - 517502**

Sri Venkateswara University Oriental Journal
Vol. 37, Pts. 1 & 2, 1994. Edited and published by
Dr. M. Srimannarayana Murti, Professor & Director, Oriental
Research Institute, Sri Venkateswara University, Tirupati, 1997.

ISSN 0081 - 3907

The responsibility for the facts stated, opinions expressed or conclusions reached, is entirely that of the authors of the articles, and the Oriental Research Institute accepts no responsibility for them.

Price Rs. 50=00

Copies can be had of:

The Librarian

Sri Venkateswara University Library

TIRUPATI-517 502

India

Laser typeset in the S.V.U. Oriental Research Institute

Printed at L.V. Graphics, Tirupati-517501

CONTENTS

Stūpa - Vedic and Buddhistic <i>Sadashiv A. Dange</i>	1
State System in Ancient Cambodia <i>Lokesh Chandra and Sudarshana Devi Singhal</i>	9
The Brhadāranyakopaniṣad - Its Place in Advaita <i>V. Swaminathan</i>	17
Tumburu <i>D. Satyanarayana</i>	27
Sanskrit in the Inscriptions of Andhradeśa <i>P.V. Parabrahma Sastry</i>	35
The Concept of Vivarta in Bhartṛhari and Śaṅkara <i>Satya Pal Narang</i>	49
Green Revolution in the Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa <i>M. Srimannarayana Murti</i>	61
The Integral Humanism of Śrī Nārāyaṇa Guru <i>V.C. Narayana Das</i>	81
The Srivaiṣṇava Āgamas and the Indigenous Tradition of South India <i>K.K.A. Venkatachari</i>	91
Music and Musical Instruments in Nāṭyaśāstra <i>C. Rajendran</i>	111
Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha's Concept of Alaṅkāra <i>K.V. Raghavacharya</i>	117

Meghadūta : Reinterpreted Satya Vrat	125
ज्ञानस्वरूपम् विषयता-प्रकारता-विशेष्यता- संसर्गतादिस्वरूपं च N.S. Ramanuja Tatacharya	139

REVIEWS

151

- H. v. Stietencron (ed): *Epic and Purāṇic Bibliography*
Biswanath Banerjee: *King Śūdraka and His Drama*
D. Diptivilasa: *Lotus (in thought, legend and culture)*
S. Ranganath: *Post Independence Doota Kavyas*
S. Ranganath: *Contribution of Women to Post Independence
Sanskrit Literature*
G.N. Bhat: *Vedic Nighaṇṭu*
R. Thangaswami Sarma: *Mīmāṃsāmañjarī* (skt)

STŪPA - VEDIC AND BUDDHISTIC

As the evidence stands, the word *stūpa* has been associated mostly with the Buddhistic structure of a peculiar type, in the post-Buddhistic period. It is also well known, that the word *stūpa* was not restricted to the funeral mounds even in the Buddhistic context. Some *stūpas* came to be built even on the belongings of the dead *arhat*, or even with nothing inside. It is proposed by some scholars that the Buddhistic *stūpas* were the result of imitation of the Vedic funeral mounds.¹ The same is the opinion about the *caitya*, the difference being only structural rather than conceptual. Though, as mentioned above, it was pointed out that the *stūpa* was an imitation of the Vedic funeral mound, it is necessary to go into the details, which have not been worked out by scholars. It is also said that the *stūpa* was the direct descendant of the sepulchral mounds of the Turanians, because the Hindus never buried, but burned their dead, and hence, there was no tumuli in the latter practice.² The similarity between the Buddhistic *stūpa* was, further, said to be that the Turanian mound was based on the practice of the tent-burial and the hut-burial.³ However, even if one tolerates this suggestion, the question is, why was the Buddhistic *stūpa* called *stūpa*? It is also suggested, that the *stūpa* has Persian affinities. It is proposed that the Persians migrated to the Punjab (India), and further still to Magadha, which was inhabited by the *Vrātyas*.⁴ The indication is, that the *Licchavis* were (influenced by?) the *Vrātyas* and imitated the Turanian custom; or, that

the Licchavis borrowed the custom of the Turanians through the Vratyas, and the Buddhistic custom of the *stūpa* was influenced by the Licchavis. This is a rather spacious argument; and, in the absence of a solid proof of the Turanian remains of that period, it is difficult to accept it. About the suggestion of the Persian influence the same is true; and that the Hindus never buried their dead is an example of incomplete observation of a time (1876) when Hindu practices do not seem to have been fully known by the author.⁵

The Buddhistic *stūpa* is of two types: One with the square base and the other with the round base. Both these types show a rounded or elongated top, surmounted by the *harmikā* or the *chatra*. The *chatra* or the *harmikā*, however, cannot be taken as the original integral part of the *stūpa*. The essential *stūpa*-structure has to be taken as either a rounded top or as an elongated one, over a square or a rounded base. If we try to get some clue from the elongated top *stūpa* of Svayambhūnātha in Nepal, we might say that the top formed the head superimposed by a conic helmet; the square frame just below it serves for the face of the Buddha. The antiquity of the belief cannot be determined with certainty; but, it must be said that it is very old⁶. It appears that *stūpa* is mentioned, for the first time, in the Vinaya texts. The Chhabbaggiya nuns are said to have made a *stūpa* over the remains of their leader.⁷

The Buddha himself mentions the *thūpa* and recommends it for the Tathāgata, the Arhat, and the Paccekabuddha, the structure being over the remains of the dead (*śarīra-stūpa*). In this context he says, that these persons deserve the *stūpa* as does a king, indicating thereby that the construction of the *stūpa* was not for an ordinary person, but for one of high rank including a respectable mendicant.⁸

A very ticklish problem presents itself if one traces the source of the practice and the name *thūpa*. There is no doubt that the word *thūpa* has its origin in the Vedic word *stūpa*. However, the Vedic evidence hardly supports the equation of *stūpa* with any funeral mound. The point deserves close study. It is said that Varuṇa, the king, established the *stūpa* in the form of a 'tree' in the bottomless void (*R̥gveda* = RV. I.24.7: *vanasya stūpam*). This is the earliest concept of the world tree, a veritable *axis mundi*; but the 'tree' is not an ordinary one. Its shoots spread downwards, while its root

is up. This is also not a naturally grown tree; because, Varuṇa is said to have placed it (*dadate*; and Sāyaṇa, *dhārayati*). It should be noted, that the *Kaṭha-upaniṣad* (II.3.1) and the *Bhagavadgītā* (XV.1) which borrow the same imagery replace the word *stūpa* with *aśvattha*, which, unlike the former (i.e. *stūpa*) is the name of a tree. The *stūpa* is not indicative of 'tree' as such, though in the expression *vanasya stūpam* the former word would indicate 'wood'. The primary meaning of *stūpa* is 'collection' (fr. $\sqrt{\text{styai}}$); and, in this case, 'an arrangement in the form of a tree'. However, this 'tree' has its supporting bottom (*budhna*) up in the sky. The later texts, mentioned above, change the word *budhna* to *mūla* (root-source). If one fixes his attention on the Vedic image alone, the *stūpa* of Varuṇa would have a rounded bottom up. From it the streaks of light (*ketavaḥ*) would shoot down (*nīcīnāḥ syuḥ*). These streaks of light were changed to 'branches' in the later texts, as they changed the *stūpa* to the *aśvattha* tree. In the original (Vedic) image, the *budhna* is the sun-disk, or the curved canopy of the sky; and the *stūpa* is the mass (collection) of light-rays that shoot from it and reach the earth. There is another place in RV where Agni is described as *aruṣa-stūpa* (III.29.3), where the *stūpa* is sought to be differentiated from the deity, the fire-god, and appears to indicate the tuft of hair, or helmet, in the form of flames. This gets support from the name *Hiraṇyastūpa*, where also the word *stūpa* occurs as the second member of the compound. The word *hiraṇyastūpa* would mean 'one having the *stūpa* of gold'. *Hiraṇyastūpa* was the seer of RV X.149 (see esp. verse 5) and was from the family of Aṅgiras. The word *stūpa* here would indicate a helmet, or a cap, or even the bunch of hair tied in a knot on the head. This would give a twofold image of *stūpa*: (i) elongated mass (cf. *stūpa* of Varuṇa) with a separate *budhna*; (ii) a canopy-like, or hair-knot-like rounded top (as we see in the case of the hair of the Buddha). The latter gets support where *stūpa* is the word used for the upper back portion of the head, along with the knot of hair tied up (*Taittirīya-brāhmaṇa* III.3.6.5; *Pañcaviṃśa-brāhmaṇa* XIII.4.4). At the *Pañcaviṃśa-brāhmaṇa* noted above, there is a graphic suggestion for *stūpa* being the rounded upper portion of the head. In the context of a ritual, it is said, as an explanation, that the horns are more pointed than the *stūpa* and the commentator, Sāyaṇa, explains: "*stūpa* is the central portion between the horns" (*stūpaḥ śṛṅgayor madhyaḥ saṃhito deśaḥ*). This is in the case of

the actual head. By extension to a cover on the head, it would mean that a rounded helmet is the *stūpa*; or, any rounded cover, or a canopy would be *stūpa*. This is one aspect. But, when the fire is said to be *aruṣa-stūpa*, as noted above, or at another place Agni is invoked to touch the top of heaven with his *stūpa-s* (RV VII.2.1: *upa sprśa divyaṃ sānu stūpaiḥ*), the *stūpa-s* are the formation of the tapering flames that rise upwards. In the first case (the *stūpa* of Varuṇa) the Buddhist *stūpa* with the rounded dome is answered; in the second the one that is conic.

How are we to explain the fact, that, though the word *stūpa* is known to the *Ṛgveda*, and even the later texts mention it, it does not occur in the funeral context in the Vedic tradition, while in the Buddhist tradition it is so used? Taking the clue from what the Buddha has said, and noted above, in the case of the *stūpa* for special persons, we could say that the Vedic custom was to build some sort of a mound over the ashes of the dead; but, in some special cases such a mound might have been more spectacular, with a tapering or dome-like canopy-like structure. But, it was not given the name *stūpa*, as the word was used in auspicious contexts, like the flames of the sacrificial fire, or a divine pole, as noted above. The rounded or canopy-like structure might have been made for kings or special priests. An interesting indication to that effect is in the request of the sage Vasiṣṭha, who implores on Varuṇa to see that he (Vasiṣṭha) does not go to the house made of clay (RV. VII.89.1: *mo ṣu varuṇa mṛṇmayam grham rājann aham gamam*). The clay-house is the monument on the ashes of the dead. That this prayer is in view of the impending death is clear from the words in a later verse from the same hymn, "As I am getting swelled like a leather-bag bloated with air" (ibid. 2), indicating dropsy or some such terminal disease. This hymn was for a person suffering from dropsy.⁹ Though the custom was to collect the bones, after cremation, in an urn, it is not probable that the word *grha* 'house' refers to the small urn. It is more probable, that it refers to a bigger structure on the urn after it was buried in the earth. Though it is not called *stūpa*, for the probable reason given above, it brings to our mind the *maṭṭikā-thūpa* of the Buddhistic tradition. This structure, called *grha*, must have been in appearance like a small house with a thatched dome and held inside it the urn. This must have been for special persons, while for the commoners there was

the less elaborate mound called *śmaśāna*, which was the 'resting place for the body' (cf. Yāska, *Nirukta* III.1: *śma* = *śarīra*+*śāna* = *śayanam*), or the mound whereunder the body (in the form of the bones collected after cremation) 'slept'. As the Vedic ritual texts deal with the sacrificial aspect of life, and the practices that are commonly followed, there is hardly any room for royal and stately funeral monuments. But, indications in the *mṛṇmayam-gṛham* cannot be bypassed. The *śmaśāna*, and likewise the 'clay-house' was not built immediately after the cremation and the collection of the bones. It was built after some period had passed, and away from the locality. The *śmaśāna* was of two types: the square one and the round one. The square one was for the followers of the Vedic gods (*daivyāḥ prajāḥ*) and the round one was for those belonging to the *asura-s* (*asuryāḥ prajāḥ*). It is further said, that the one for the 'godly people' (i.e. Vedic) was not separated from the ground, while the other one was separated (*Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa* XIII.8.1.1ff). The Vedic *śmaśāna-s* were of different sizes, depending upon the *varṇa* of a person. For a *brāhmaṇa* it was high up to the mouth of a person; that for a *kṣatriya* it was up to the chest; for a *vaiśya* it was up to the thighs and for a *śudra* it had to be up to the knees. For a woman (of all *varṇa-s*) it was to be up to the hips.

From what has been noted above, the Buddhistic *stūpa* appears to have been evolved from the *śmaśāna* structure mentioned in the Vedic texts. It is not improbable that the *asurya* type mentioned therein, the round one, was borrowed by the Buddhists from a non-Vedic practice. It is not necessary to believe that the *asurya* practice was of a non-Indian origin; and, though it was non-Vedic, there was a continuous effort for the assimilation of the Vedic and the non-Vedic. The post-Rgvedic texts on ritual, as a rule, stress that the gods and the *asura-s* were both sons of Prajāpati, though they always contested. As has been said earlier, there seems a probability of the *stūpa*-like structure being prevalent even among the more affluent and honoured persons who followed the Vedic religion. This structure called *gṛha* must have been over and above the *śmaśāna*; but the word *stūpa* was not popularly used for it. However, there is no doubt that the Buddhistic word *stūpa* presupposes its use even among the Vedic people, though it is not recorded. How else could the word be suddenly seen used for such

a structure in the Buddhistic literature? It is clear that, like the word *vihāra*, they adopted it from the usage of the Vedic people. The word *vihāra* is also from the Vedic sacrificial context;¹⁰ it is for the enclosure where the fires were kept. The Buddhists adopted such word for *stūpa*.

Another word to be considered in this context is *caitya*. This word does not occur in the Vedic texts as such. It is seen used in the Sūtra period, which concurs with the rise of the Buddha and the Buddhistic faith, and also with the rise of the Jain faith. However, *caitya* was more prevalent in the Jain faith, and among all these faiths it was not restricted to the mound or structure over the ashes of the dead. As in the later period the *stūpa* was erected even on a hair or a nail of a living Buddha, the *caitya* came to be any thing including a hall, a tree and a shrine. The later Buddhistic faith applied the term *caitya* also for a funeral mound. This is clear from the account that a Bodhisattva called Sarvasattva Priyadarśana wrapped his body with the cloth steeped in aromatic oils and set fire to it, and caused to be erected as many as 84,000 (obviously a mythical number!) *caitya-s*.¹¹ A regular practice of preparing *caitya-s* from the clay mixed with oil and honey and cutting them lengthwise obtains in the later Buddhistic period among the Buddhists of Nepal, along with the gift of such miniature *caitya-s*.¹² Among the Jains initiation took place in a *caityālaya*,¹³ and one Hindu *Gr̥hyasūtra* speaks of *Caitya-yajña*. It is the *Āśvalāyana-gr̥hya-sūtra* (I.12.1-4) which recommends even sending an offering to a *caitya*, if it is in a far off place. In any case, the origin of the *caitya* is in *citi* or *cita*, which is 'pile'; and the earliest concept of the *citi*, and hence of the *caitya*, is in the Vedic rite of *Agnicayana*. The *Satapatha-brāhmaṇa* (VI.2.3.1) uses the word *citi*. There is mention of various such *citi-s* or *cita-s* in the context of the *Agnicayana*, including the *śmaśāna-cita*,¹⁴ and the *Agnicayana* rite goes back far prior to the pre-Buddhistic period, as it is mentioned in the post-R̥gvedic *Saṃhitās*. The *Agnicayana* is, virtually, *Agnicitī*; or, in other words, we may call it *Agnicaitya*, though no structure remained at the place after the rite was over. The worship of the *caitya* continued in the Hindu tradition. The *Rāmāyaṇa* (Ayodhyā. 56.33)¹⁵ and the *Mahābhārata* (Vana.190.67) mention it. In fine we could say, that the *stūpa*¹⁶ and the *caitya* have their origin in the Vedic practice and concept.

REFERENCES

1. T.N. Ramachandran, 'A Brief Survey of Buddhistic Art', in: *2500 Years of Buddhism*, Govt. of India Pbn., New Delhi, 1976 (1959), p.247.
2. J. Fergusson, *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture*, vol. I, Delhi, 1967, p. 65.
3. *ibid.*
4. S. Vidyabhusana, 'Persian Affinities of the Licchavis', in: *Indian Antiquary*, vol. 37, 1908, p. 79.
5. The author was, obviously, speaking about the general practice in ancient India. There are some castes among the Hindus who practice burial; and, with children burial is the general practice.
6. J. Fergusson, *op.cit.* p. 276.
7. Meena V. Talim, 'Origin of the Chabbagīyas', *Proceedings of the Prakrit Seminar*, University of Bombay, 1971, p. 214.
8. *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, ed. Bhikṣu Kittima; published by U. Kyo-Zan, Akyab, Burma; printed at the Indian Press Ltd., Benares, Vikrama Samvat 1998 (=1941 A.D.), pp. 110-112 (sūtra-s 191-195).
9. H.D. Velankar, *R̥gveda - Maṇḍala VII*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1963, p.195.
10. P.V. Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol.II, B.O.R.I., second edn., Poona, 1974, p. 984.
11. Rajendralal Mitra, *Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal*, Cosmo Pbn., Delhi, 1981 (1882), p.206. The number is mythical; cf. 84000 years of separation between the Buddha and Śreṇīya Bimbisāra; also the Hindu concept of a cycle of 84000 births (*yoni-s*). Fergusson, *op.cit.* p. 67, appears to take the number as real.
12. Rajendralal Mitra, *op.cit.* p. 256; gifts of clay-*caityas*, p. 229; *caitya-vrata*, p. 279, etc.
13. Sindhu S. Dange, *Jaina Dharma āṇi Tattvajñāna*, Continental Prakashan, Pune, 1980, p. 138.
14. cf. *Taittiriya-saṃhitā*, V.4.10 where the word is *cita*; some of the *cita-s* mentioned are *śyenacita*, *kaṅkacita*, *droṇacita*; and *śmaśānacita*.

15. The *Rāmāyaṇa* mentions here the establishing of Vedic altars along with the *caityasthāna*-s.
16. It may be noted that a *stūpa* found in the precincts of Vat Vishun in Luang Prabang (Laos) has a flame-like projection at the top. Otherwise it is similar to the *stūpa* at Sanchi, which has a rounded top; see T.N. Ramachandran, op.cit. p.265.

LOKESH CHANDRA
SUDARSHANA DEVI SINGHAL

STATE SYSTEM IN ANCIENT CAMBODIA

There were two major state ceremonies in ancient Cambodia: (i) the *accession* of a king to the throne, followed by (ii) the *coronation* within the next few years, with due selection of the site, preparation for the architectural complex and the consecration of the coronation icon.

On *accession* the king either (i) inherited the palladium of his father or predecessor, or (ii) he took possession of the national palladium, if any, which pertained to the state over the centuries, and not necessarily to his dynasty alone.

On *coronation* the king had an icon consecrated specifically for the occasion. It was the regnal icon, distinguished from the national palladium. As the regnal icon was associated with the ruling monarch, it was named after him, for example, Indreśvara was the Liṅga of Īśvara commissioned by Indravarman.

As the kings of Cambodia were mostly Śaiva, they consecrated Śaiva Liṅgas. The Uttarakāṇḍa of the *Rāmāyaṇa* states that wherever Rāvaṇa went, he carried his Golden Liṅga, and worshipped it from the desire of sovereignty (*jāmbunada-mayaṃ liṅgaṃ sthāpya rāvaṇaḥ arcayāmāsa....*). The Tantras state that a Golden Liṅga should be worshipped when anyone desires sovereignty (Rao 1914:

2/1.78n). The tradition of regnal Liṅgas in Cambodia goes back to the sixth century in the Pre-Angkorian Chenla period (Kulke 1993:335). The Prah That Kvan Fir inscription dated Śaka 638= A.D. 716, in Sanskrit records that Puṣkara had divine Puṣkareśa consecrated by eminent brahman sages (*devaś śrī-puṣkareśo dvijavara-munibhis sthāpitaḥ puṣkareṇa*). Puṣkara is identical with king Puṣkarākṣa mentioned in the inscriptions of Yaśovarman and Rājendravarman (Majumdar 1953:55). Briggs (1951:60) believes it to be "the first example in Cambodian history of the apotheosis of a king". The Puṣkareśa was erected by brahmans under instructions of the king. He had it done to ensure his personal well-being as well as that of his people through the divine grace of Śiva. How could he apotheosize *himself*? The Liṅga was installed by kings for coronation rites and its worship was conducted regularly by learned and virtuous brahmans. King Udayādityavarman built a Mount of Gold in the centre of his capital, in emulation of the abode of gods situated in the centre of Hemādri (= Meru) in Jambudvīpa. He consecrated a Golden Liṅga on top of his Golden Mount and appointed Śaṅkara-panḍita as its priest (*yājaka*). Barth has mis-translated *kāladhautaṃ... liṅgaṃ* as "a liṅga of Śiva, honoured with ablutions at the prescribed times." *Kāladhauta* means 'golden'. The Golden Liṅga (*kāladhautaṃ... śaiva-liṅgaṃ, svarṇaliṅga*) in stanzas 24 and 26 refers to the royal Liṅga, and conveys no impression of apotheosis (Barth 1885:131, Briggs 171). The irresistible fascination with apotheosis, funerary monuments, and the like impede the understanding of Cambodian history. The general religious ambience of Cambodia and Champa was of Śaiva Āgamas. Both followed the Āgamic rites, wherein the installation or consecration of the image of Śiva or His Liṅga for general well-being was common. For instance Śambhuvarman re-consecrated (*pratiṣṭhāpitaḥ*) the Śambhu-Bhadreśvara which had been burnt down. It had originally been consecrated by Bhadravarman (Majumdar 1927:2.10: *campādeśe janayatu sukhaṃ śambubhadreśvaro 'yaṃ*). King Indravarman of Champa reconstructed the temple of Bhadrādhīpatiśvara in Śaka 721= A.D. 799 which had been destroyed by invaders from across the seas, consecrated (*sthāpitaṃ*) a royal Liṅga, thence known as Indra-bhadreśvara, which protected the earth, and delighted his subjects. The King donated lands to Indrabhadreśvara, the cause of the happiness of the whole world. In this inscription *pārthivaṃ liṅgaṃ* has been mistranslated as 'earthen

Liṅga'. *Pārthiva* means 'royal' in this context (ib. 44-51). In Śaka 776=A.D. 854 King Vikrāntavarman granted lands to two temples of Śiva: Vikrānta-rudreśvara and Vikrānta-devādhībhaveśvara. The words *sakala-jagad-hitakaraṇāya* 'for the prosperity of the whole world', *kīrtaye sa eva śubham adāt* 'gave a meritorious gift for the sake of glory' are a clear indication that the first part of the king's name followed by *Īśvara* indicates the meritorious action of the king while alive. It has nothing to do with apotheosis. The Bhadreśvara temple, like Paśupatināth in Nepal, was the national shrine of Śiva, a symbol of the people and king of Champa (ib. 2.72f.). To endow or maintain existing Liṅgas, or to establish or consecrate new Liṅgas was a pious duty performed by kings, their relations and may be by others. Their name was associated with the new icon: Bhadravarman established the *Bhadreśvara* 'the *Īśvara* icon established by Bhadra[varman].'

Śrīkaṇṭha Śivācārya, in his commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*, says: "We do not perceive any difference between the *Vedas* and the *Śivāgamas*" (*na vayan veda-śivāgamayor bhedaṃ paśyāmaḥ*, Rao 1914:2/1.9). Both the traditions were fortified by Jayavarman II. He instituted the Ṛgvedic *rājasūya* rites of *aindra mahābhīṣeka* under the appellation of Devarāja (= Indra) and the Āgamic Śaiva ritual was integrated into it as the consecration of the Śaiva Liṅga atop the Golden Mount (Meru). The third stream was the devastating Tantric rituals of *Vināśikha*. The occurrence of words like *Ṛgveda*, *hotā* and *abhikhyā* indicates the introduction of Vedic rites by Jayavarman II. *Abhikhyā* in the Sanskrit inscription is used in the Ṛgvedic sense of overawing lustre or radiance that pre-empt the enemy from rash action. *Abhikhyā* is translated as *Entgegenstrahlung* 'radiance against [the opponent to counteract him]', *Lichtschein* 'lustre, glow' by Hermann Grassman (*Wörterbuch zum Rigveda*, Leipzig, 1872:83). In RV. 1.148.5 men are blinded by his splendour and cannot hurt him. The *mantra* 1.155.5 to Viṣṇu-Indra points out that a mortal who beholds two steps of him is restless and ventures not to approach the third step. The verse 2.30.9 asks Indra and others to pierce with his *abhikhyā* one who would destroy us. The verse 4.17.17 invokes Indra to be the guardian (*abhikhyātā*) for vital strength and freedom. The verse 8.23.5 refers to the imperishable flame of Agni, shining with lofty splendour, with effulgent resplendence (*abhikhyā bhāsā bṛhatā śusukvaniḥ*) to

give us riches combined with hero strength as Lord of Power and Might (RV. 8.23.12), and to avert all the demon hosts (8.23.13). The verse 10.112.10 implores Indra to be the *abhikhyā* of the suppliant, as he is the great warrior, the truly valiant, for nothing is done, even far away, without thee (*na ṛte tvat kriyate kiṃ cana*). The Sanskrit inscription brings to the fore the *élan vital* of Devarāja Indra in the phrase *devarājābhikhyā*. *Abhikhyā* was the overawing presence, the stern majesty, the sense of overwhelming superiority, the spectacle and style of the newly won political apogee of Jayavarman II. "The spectacle by suggesting that strength untold, riches unaccountable, lay behind the facade of empire, the style, by making the empire always seem a more formidable people, a more different people, than they really were" (cf. Morris 1982). It was the charisma of his imperial presence.

Jayavarman II introduced the hereditary position of the *hotā* besides that of the *purohita*. *Hotā* was the priest for Ṛgvedic *yajñas*, while *purohita* was the chief priest for all worship rituals (Briggs 82, 90). The *hotā* of Cambodian kings were as follows:

<i>Hotā</i>	<i>of King</i>	<i>A.D.</i>	<i>Briggs</i>
Śikhāśānti	Indravarman I	877-889	95,98
Śikhāśiva	Yaśovarman I	889-900+	105,114
Śivācārya	Īśānavarman II		131
Īśānamūrti	Jayavarman IV	928-	116
Śivācārya	Rājendravarman II	944-968	124
Śaṅkara	"	"	"
Nārāyaṇa	Jayavarman V	968-1001	134
hotā	Sūryavarman II	1113-1150	Coedes IC.3.183
Hṛṣīkeśa	Jayavarman VII	1181-1215+	229
Vidyēśavid	"	1243-	243
" crowned	Indravarman III		243-251
Vidyēśa-dhimān	Indrajayavarman	1308-1327	252
"	Jayavarman Para- meśvara	1327-	253

The R̥gvedic *hotā* was a continuing institution of the Cambodian state from the ninth to the fourteenth century, as can be seen in the above tabulation. The Bat Chum inscriptions give regulations regarding the bathing place (*tīrtha*) of Bat Chum where only the *hotā* and brahmans who knew the *Vedas* could bathe (Briggs 1951:131). The Sanskrit inscription says in the Old Khmer portion that Ātmaśiva was the *ācāryahoma* of His Majesty Śivaloka (= Rājendravarman II) (D 36-39, Briggs 124). *Ācārya-homa* is *homa-ācārya* 'the *ācārya* for *homa* rites' that is, *hotā*. The Prasat Kandol Dom (North) inscription of Indravarman speaks of clouds of smoke gusts arising from the *yajñāgni-hotra* pervading the skies (*yasya yajñāgni-hotrāṇām khe babhur dhūmapaṅktayaḥ*, st.21, Majumdar 1953:59). The *agni-hotras* were performed daily and hence the continuing role of the *hotā*. Later on in stanza 40, Śivasoma is stated to be a scholar of the *Vedas* (*veḍavid*). The brāhmaṇa Divākara of Jayavarman V knew the *Sāmaveda*, and crushed the heads of enemies with *mantras* (*sāmavidā ... ripu-bhogi-bhogān mamardda mantraiḥ ...*, Prasat Komphus inscription dated 892, Majumdar 1953:296). The *R̥gveda* (*bahvṛca*) is referred to in the Banteay Srei inscription of Jayavarman V dated A.D. 890 (ib.273). The sounds of the *Veda* are invoked for protection against the enemy in the Prasat Andon inscription of Jayavarman IV (ib.172). The inscriptions refer to constant performance of *yajñas*. The Preah Ko stele of Indravarman speaks of smoke rising from the sacrifices from his abode (ib.52). Jayavarman V appointed Kavīśvara to the rites of sacred fire (*agnikārya*, Lovek inscription of Harṣavarman III, Majumdar 1953:422). The smoke arising from fire rites needed several vents or large windows to escape, otherwise it would choke and suffocate the officiants. These *yajñasālās* have been termed 'libraries', and their real function has been missed. Mazzeo and Antonini (1978:87) point out that "the name 'libraries' is purely conventional, for in reality we have no idea what this type of building was used for. Such 'libraries' have been found dating back as far as the Preah Ko period. Built of brick ... they were square in shape, at least at the outset, and had one door only, plus a number of small windows." These small windows were vents for smoke to pour out. The rectangular brick 'libraries' at Prasat Phnom Chisor are lighted on each side by two highly-placed rectangular windows (Briggs 161): they seem to be smoke vents. They have a parallel

in the Pawon near Borobudur, which is termed *Bajranalan*, as it was a homa temple (Lokesh Chandra 1995-36f.).

The primary function of the 'libraries' was as (i) *yajñasālās* with vents for the smoke to escape, but they could also have been (ii) *sacristies* for keeping sacred vessels or vestries for ritual vestments, besides (iii) *libraries* for books. An inscription, without date, found in the ruined edicule of Prasat Khna indicates that this edifice was a library (Briggs 131). According to Chinese dynastic histories Funan had libraries and collections of books (19). Such buildings are called 'libraries' by the Thais and Laotians. The *yajñasālā* culture disappeared when Angkor ceased to exist and the role of these edifices was forgotten. They were deemed to be libraries in the new Buddhist ambience with its accent on the Tripitaka and its commentaries which ran into several hundred codices. 'Libraries' appear alongside the central chapel from the time of Indravarman (99) who performed sacrifices. The 'library' and *gopura* were two architectural innovations of this period (100). Briggs points out pairs of 'libraries' in the following monuments:

<i>Page</i>		
101	Preah Ko	
119	Prasat Thom	Created by Jayavarman (921-941)
120	Prasat Pram	
130	Prasat Khna	Rājendravarman II (944-958)
135	Banteay Srei	Founded in 967
161	Prasat Phnom Chisor	
171	Baphuon	Udayādityavarman II (1050-1066)
182	Prasat Phnom Rung	Sūryavarman I (1011-1050)
191	Chausay Tevoda	Sūryavarman II (1113-1150)
192	Banteay Samre	Sūryavarman II
197, 201	Angkor Wat	Sūryavarman II
214	Ta Prohm of Bati	Jayavarman VII (1181-1219)
221	Preah Khan	Jayavarman VII

Apotheosis has been made a cornerstone of Cambodian history as the Devarāja cult. But no tendencies can be discerned in

Cambodia to apotheosize the ruling king. The king, in fact conducted various rites to proclaim his just government by just means. Three important state events characterised the reign of a king:

1. *Accession.* King Jayavarman II founded the state of Cambodia by giving it the name Kambuja, and by creating the national capital region of Angkor. His *aindra* coronation was denoted by the term Devarāja (= Indra) and his regnal icon of Śiva came to be known as *kamraten jagat ta rāja* (KJR). Lord Śiva was the Lord of the Universe as well as the Kingdom on this earth: *jagat* means 'universe', as against *rāja* = *rājya* 'kingdom'. Thus the new state was sanctified in perpetuity. The KJR became the national palladium with his successors. It was the continuing state. His successors exercised power by virtue of taking control of the KJR, the insignia of power. If they shifted to a new capital, they took it along.

2. *Ancestor temples.* If a king was not the crown prince or in direct royal descent, he sought his legitimation by enshrining his royal ancestors in specially erected ancestor temples. Sometimes the king was blue-blooded from the maternal side. So parents and grandparents on both the paternal and maternal sides were enshrined as gods and goddesses. It lent the charisma of royal descent to the king and irradiated regnal aura in the minds of his subjects. It was the enshrinement of ancestors (*pitṛyāna*) and not the apotheosis of the regnant king.

3. *Coronation rites* were introduced on a grand scale by Jayavarman II. They included (i) the construction of a Central Mount (Vnam Kantal) or Golden Mount in the centre of the new capital, (ii) the consecration of a new coronation icon, the Śaiva Liṅga, named after the king to be crowned, and (iii) these rites being R̥gvedic were performed by a R̥gvedic priest technically known as the Hotā. The controversy surrounding Devarāja, the Regnal Liṅga, ancestor temples and apotheosis has been reviewed above in the light of a Government of the Time (Royal Liṅga) in the syndrome of a Perpetual State (KJR), truly and firmly laid by both Vedic and Āgamic rites and if need be in sublime blessings of ancestors in the symbiosis of *devayāna* and *pitṛyāna*.

LITERATURE CITED

Barth 1885

A. Barth, 'Inscriptions Sanscrites du Cambodge', *Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris.

Briggs 1951

Lawrence Palmer Briggs, *The Ancient Khmer Empire*, Philadelphia (Trans. of the American Philosophical Society, n.s. 41/1).

Kulke 1993

Hermann Kulke, *The Devarāja Cult*, legitimation and apotheosis of the ruler in the kingdom of Angkor, Cornell University (xerox copy from the author).

Lokesh Chandra 1995

Lokesh Chandra, *Cultural Horizons of India*, vol. 4, New Delhi (Aditya Prakashan).

MA

Donatella Mazzeo and Chiara Silvi Antonini, *Ancient Combodia*, London (Cassell Ltd.) 1978.

Majumdar 1927

R.C. Majumdar, *Champa*, Lahore.

Majumdar 1953

R.C. Majumdar, *Inscriptions of Kambuja*, Calcutta (The Asiatic Society).

Morris 1982

Jan Morris, *The Spectacle of Empire*, London (Faber and Faber).

Rao 1914

T.A. Gopinatha Rao, *Elements of Hindu Iconography*, reprinted in 1968 by Motilal Banarsidass, New Delhi.

THE BRHADĀRANYAKOPANIṢAD ITS PLACE IN ADVAITA

The *Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* [= Br.Up.] also known as *Vājasaneyi-Brāhmaṇopaniṣad* holds a unique position in the realm of Advaita Vedānta. Its being mentioned last in the traditional enumeration of the ten major *upaniṣads*¹ possesses a special significance when taken together with the mentioning of the *Īśāvāsyā*, as the first, another *upaniṣad* belonging to the same Vedic school, viz., the *Vājasaneyi-śākhā*. Right from very remote times the Vedāntic tradition has been unanimously maintaining that all the *upaniṣads* have a common purpose and they consistently teach one and the same reality even though the method of treatment and the arrangement of the matter vary from one *upaniṣad* to the other². The *Īśāvāsyā*, with the exception of *Māṇḍūkya*, is the shortest among the *upaniṣads*, and the *Brhadāraṇyaka* the largest. The truth enshrined in the *Īśāvāsyā*, receiving in graded stages fuller elucidation and greater elaboration in the other eight *upaniṣads*, finds its fullest exposition in the *Brhadāraṇyaka*. The science of the self (*ātmavidyā*) has found expression, in both the forms - contracted and expanded - in the same *śākhā*. In fact the Vedic tradition firmly asserts that the *Brhadāraṇyaka* is the *brāhmaṇa* (amplification) of the *Īśāvāsyā*. In short the exposition of *ātmavidyā* has culminated in the teachings of *Brhadāraṇyaka* and we will not be deflecting from truth if we say that the *Brhadāraṇyaka* presents

the perfection attained by *ātmavidyā*, comprehending within itself the teaching of all the other *upaniṣads*.

The *Brhadāranyaka* had remained, all through the ages, a perennial source of inspiration to all the teachers and expounders of Advaita and they have enriched their contribution by freely and profitably drawing upon it.

The profound wisdom it displays, the sublime philosophy it expounds, the incisive analysis it conducts into the human personality and experiences in all their aspects, the marvellous sincerity and earnestness with which it undertakes enquiry into the various metaphysical and epistemological problems and the grandeur it exhibits in the dialogues and disputations, where sage Yājñavalkya is the dominating figure, have earned for this *upaniṣad* the appellation *brhat* 'grand'. Ānandagiri observes, "besides being great in extent, this *upaniṣad* is great in what it conveys too, because it not only unfolds the infinite Brahman but also deals with all the necessary means that lead the aspirant to an immediate realization of the Brahman."³

It is a matter of great interest to see that the name Advaita by which the philosophy of the *upaniṣads*, that took its characteristic form and shape in the hands of Śaṅkara after passing through Bādarāyaṇa, Gauḍapāda and other illustrious preceptors, is known as derived from the *Brhadāranyakopaniṣad*.⁴ Br.Up. contains numerous *mahāvākyas*, statements that purport the identity of the individual self (*ātman*) with the universal self (Brahman).⁵

In teaching the identity of *ātman* and Brāhman Br.Up., besides handling the direct and indirect methods as the other *upaniṣads*, employs a new device which is rather striking and interesting. In the statement यत् साक्षादपरोक्षं ब्रह्म य आत्मा सर्वत्र⁶ the *upaniṣad* deliberately displaces the attributes. Brahman is characterized as "immediate and direct" and the individual self as "that which is within all." Really it is the individual self that is "immediate and direct" and Brahman, being all-pervasive is "that which is within all" and as such the attributes must exchange places.⁷ The purpose of the transference of the attributes of the one to the other is to

stress the fundamental identity of the *jīvātman* and Brahman and to dispel the wrong notion that the *jīva* is different from Brahman.

The self-luminosity or self-revealing character (*svaprakāśa*) of the *ātman*, one of the pivotal doctrines of Advaita, is not only referred to but also fully demonstrated, in successive stages, by employing unambiguous language and adducing unassailable arguments in the celebrated *Jyotirbrāhmaṇa*⁸ of Br.Up.

That consciousness exists at all times (even in times of deep sleep), irrespective of the presence of the object to be lit, is another lofty truth Br.Up. has to teach thinking minds: "The vision of the seer is never lost,"⁹ "During sound sleep, seeing, he sees not."¹⁰ The purport here is that the everlasting awareness is there; but there is neither the seen (object) nor the seer (subject) as the relation of the seer and the seen has totally dissolved leaving pure consciousness to shine in its inherent glory.

Advaita recognizes two types of cognitions, viz., *vṛtti-jñāna* and *svarūpa-jñāna*. *Vṛtti-jñāna* is that which arises when the *pramāṇas* such as the *pratyakṣa* are operative. It consists of two aspects – the *vṛtti* or modification of the internal organ (*antaḥkaraṇa*) and consciousness, the latter being delimited by the former. It follows that *vṛtti-jñāna* is liable to origination and dissolution as the *vṛtti* is subject to production and destruction. It is called *anityadṛṣṭi*. Consciousness which is conditioned by *vṛtti* is, by nature, eternal and exists in itself at all times and it is called *nityadṛṣṭi*. It is by the self-luminous consciousness that the *vṛtti* is able to reveal empirical objects, as in itself, it is non-luminous (*jaḍa*). This two-fold division of knowledge lies embedded in the passage: नहि द्रष्टृदृष्टिर्विपरिलोपो विद्यतेऽविनाशित्वात्।¹¹ Śaṅkara has brought this twofold division of cognition to the surface with his penetrating vision which at once explains the apparent conflict between our day to day experience and the eternality of consciousness proclaimed in the *śrutis*.

That Brahman defies any positive description and that there is no means of knowing Brahman other than the negative approach find assertion only in Br.Up.¹² The explicit mention that *śruti* is the only *pramāṇa* that can enlighten one on the true nature

of the self¹³ is another speciality that distinguishes Br.Up. from other *upaniṣads*.

Advaita derives from Br.Up. the concept of the principle of Māyā or Avidyā that plays a vital role in establishing the oneness of Reality. Both the terms *māyā* and *avidyā* are not only met within the same *upaniṣad* but also used in the sense in which they are understood in Advaita.¹⁴

The oneness of the *ātman* and the falsity of the world are maintained in Advaita by the phenomenon called *vivarta* which consists in one entity assuming temporarily a variety of forms foreign to its own intrinsic form without suffering any transformation whatsoever.

The stock example of *vivarta* is the instance of the rope-serpent which merges into the rope and becomes one with it, without leaving any trace, simultaneously with the emergence of the knowledge of the rope. The *Maitreyī-brāhmaṇa* of Br.Up. brings the concept of *vivarta* to the forefront in bold relief. First Yājñavalkya declares that "all is *ātman*"¹⁵ and there exists nothing over and above this *ātman*. The identity of the *ātman* and all (the sentient and insentient beings) could become intelligible only in the light of the phenomenon of *vivarta* and any phenomenon like *pariṇāma* cannot satisfactorily account for the one sentient being appearing an altogether different entity without undergoing any change. To present this fact with greater force and clarity, Yājñavalkya further asserts, "Where all had become *ātman* alone, who should see what with what instrument?"¹⁶ What is meant in the above statement is that as at the time of final liberation resulting from the realization of the true nature of *ātman* every thing becomes one with *ātman*, like the serpent with the rope, without leaving any residue *ātman* is the entity left alone without anything that may serve as the object or the instrument of seeing. The insentient universe of diversity becoming one with the *ātman* (pure consciousness) on the dawn of the realization of the *ātman* is an unmistakable instance of *vivarta*. It is Br.Up. that proclaims in plain words the illusory character or *mithyātva* of the world of duality in passages like यत्र हि द्वैतमिव भवति तदितर इतरं चिन्नति तदितर इतरं पश्यति¹⁷ and य इह नानेव पश्यति¹⁸ and finally asserts the non-existence of the world in the ultimate reality (नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन).¹⁹

Advaita has accepted the concept of grades of reality. It does not assign the same ontological status to both Brahman and the world. Brahman is of a higher order of reality, *pāramārthika-satya* and the world belongs to an inferior order of reality (*vyāvahārika-satya*). The above statement, therefore, it must be understood, denies only ultimate reality, *pāramārthika-satyatva*, for the world and does not rule out the admissibility of empirical reality for the world and hence it does not come into conflict with our experience. The significant use of *iva* (as if) in the previous passages shows the acceptance of some sort of reality – empirical reality – to the world. The concept of the grades in reality is established solely on the authority of Br.Up. which explicitly mentions two types of reality in the sentence सत्यस्य सत्यम्।²⁰ This sentence will hardly convey any sense, if both the words (one in the nominative case and other in the genitive) are taken to convey the same sense. It will give rise to an intelligible sense only when some distinction is admitted in the meanings of the two words. To make the sentence intelligible the *upaniṣad* undertakes to explain the meaning of the sentence as प्राणा वै सत्यं तेषामेष सत्यम्।²¹ Here the *upaniṣad* draws out a sharp difference in the reality of the world (implied by *prāṇa*) and that of the *ātman*. This distinction will be meaningless if the world is granted the same ontological status as the Brahman. Therefore reality has to be understood as two-fold. The only possible difference that could be conceived with reference to reality is (1) real at all times (*कालत्रयानाद्यम्*) and (2) tentatively real (*व्यवहारकालानाद्यम्*). Brahman is real at all times and the world is real only tentatively (i.e. until the time of the realization of the self). But for the concept of the ‘grades of reality’ numerous contradictions would crop up within the *upaniṣadic* texts and would remain unresolved.

Br.Up. is emphatic in the matter of the doctrine of ‘liberation even while alive’ (*jīvanmukti*). “Then the mortal becomes immortal and he becomes Brahman in this body itself.”²² Liberation does not wait for death or journey to the other world. In no other *upaniṣad* *jīvanmukti* has been delineated with so much eloquence.

Another instance where Br.Up. deviates from the other *upaniṣads* is in its view regarding the nature of *saṃsāra* or bondage. Bondage is the outcome of the self (*ātman*) associating or identifying itself with the notself (*anātman*). According to the other

upaniṣads the *anātman* consists of *nāma* (name) and *rūpa* (form) and the *ātman* who is devoid of form and name becomes bound or fettered by assuming name and form or identifying himself with those that possess name and form. Br.Up. adds *karman* or action and conceives the not-self a trio consisting of *nāma*, *rūpa* and *karman*.²³ These three form a composite and inseparable whole where each component is dependent on the other for its very existence, manifestation and dissolution.

It is in Br.Up. that we find explicit mention of the three causes, *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *nididhyāsana*,²⁴ that bring about *ātma-darśana* (immediate realization of the self) the avowed goal of the Vedānta. *Śravaṇa* consists in determining the purport of the *upaniṣads*, *manana* in an intelligent understanding of the truths of the *upaniṣads* in the light of logic and reasoning and *nididhyāsana* in contemplating upon what has been determined and verified by the exercise of reasoning. Br.Up. has fully recognized the inestimable value of reasoning in philosophical thinking and has counted *manana* next only to *śravaṇa* in importance. In no other *upaniṣad* do we come across such an exalted position assigned to reasoning as is done here. It will be a matter of absorbing interest to note that Br.Up. had not only prescribed *manana* as an indispensable aid to *ātma-sākṣātkāra* but had actually demonstrated at length what it had prescribed. In the first two chapters, known as *Madhu-kāṇḍa*, it expounds the true nature of *ātman*; in the next two chapters, known as *Muni-kāṇḍa* or *Yājñavalkīya-kāṇḍa* it establishes the truth of the teachings of the first two chapters by a free exercise of reasoning²⁵ and in the last two chapters known as *Khila-kāṇḍa* it deals with certain exercises in meditation (*upāsana*) as a preliminary to *nididhyāsana*. The importance of *manana* lies in that it affords a firm footing to truths known from *śravaṇa* liberating them from the grip of all possible doubts.

The insistence of Br.Up. on the exercise of reasoning in philosophical thought had left an indelible impression on Śaṅkara's mind. In all his commentaries he has pressed into service his marvellous faculty of reasoning. On several occasions, he has openly stressed the importance of reasoning.²⁶ His observation in Br.Up. on the role of reasoning is instructive and enlightening.

उपपत्तिप्रधानत्वादतिक्रान्तेन मधुकाण्डेन समानार्थत्वेऽपि सति न पुनरुक्तता; मधुकाण्डं ह्यागमप्रधानम्। आगमोपपत्ती ह्यात्मैकत्वप्रकाशनाय प्रवृत्ते शक्नुतः करतलगतबिल्वमिव दर्शयितुम्; 'श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यः' इति ह्युक्तम्; तस्मादागमार्थस्यैव परीक्षापूर्वकं निर्धारणाय याज्ञवल्कीयं काण्डमुपपत्तिप्रधानमारभ्यते। अपि च तद्विद्यसंयोगस्तैश्च सह वादकरणं विद्याप्राप्त्युपायो न्यायविद्यायां दृष्टः; तच्चास्मिन्नध्याये प्राबल्येन प्रदर्शयति; प्रत्यक्षा च विद्वत्संयोगे प्रज्ञावृद्धिः॥²⁷

One cannot fail to notice in the passage cited above the height to which Śaṅkara has elevated the importance of reason and logic in ascertaining the truth of the Vedānta.

Of all his commentaries only in the one on Br.Up. Śaṅkara had displayed his consummate skill in argumentation and given expression to his logical thinking to the maximum extent. The *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad-bhāṣya* bristles with long discussions and penetrating analysis in almost every passage, from the very beginning to the end. He arrives at the true import of problematic passages only after subjecting them, in all possible ways, to searching criticism and cogent reasoning. The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* embraces almost all the topics in philosophy and hence provides Śaṅkara with ample opportunity to enter into rational investigations at every step. Any philosophical point of importance stirs him to conduct detailed enquiry. In Br.Up.-*bhāṣya* he had debated and settled ever so many philosophical issues which could not find a place in his *Bhāṣya* on the *Brahmasūtras*.²⁸ In fact his *Bhāṣya* on Br.Up. stands on a par with his *Śārīraka-bhāṣya* in its richness and variety of philosophical contents and depth of philosophical wisdom. Sureśvara rightly observes that under the pretext of expounding Br.Up., Śaṅkara had really sublimated the true meaning of the entire *Veda*.²⁹

All that Advaita Vedānta stands for is already contained in the *upaniṣads* and the task that Śaṅkara set before himself was to provide a rational basis to the philosophy taught in the *upaniṣads*. This he achieves with his wide and profound learning in the *Vedas* together with their accessories and his awe-inspiring mastery over logic. In his commentaries he has not imported any thing that is foreign to the spirit of the *upaniṣadic* teachings.

What has been said in the foregoing account, though brief, is sufficient to disclose the dignified position Br.Up. occupies in

Advaita and the magnetic influence it wielded over the mighty intellect of Śaṅkara. One will not fail to note that for certain important concepts and principles Advaita solely depends on Br.Up.

REFERENCES

1. ईशकेनकठप्रश्नमुण्डमाण्डूक्यतित्तिरिः।
ऐतरेयं च छान्दोग्यं बृहदारण्यकं दश॥
2. It is interesting to note that a modern European savant also concurs with the traditional view. "All these conceptions, however, gather so entirely around one common centre and are determined so completely by the one thought of the sole reality of the *ātman* that they all present themselves as manifold variations upon one and the same theme, which is treated at one time more briefly or again at greater length, now from the starting point of the empirical consciousness and now in abrupt contradiction thereto. Accordingly all individual differences are so entirely overshadowed by the one fundamental conception," P. Deussen, *The Philosophy of the Upaniṣads*, 1972, pp. 51-52.
3. उपनिषदन्तरेभ्यः ग्रन्थपरिमाणातिरेकादस्य बृहत्त्वं प्रसिद्धम्, अर्थतोऽपि तदस्ति ब्रह्मणोऽखण्डैकरसस्यात्र प्रतिपाद्यत्वात् तज्ज्ञानहेतूनां चान्तरङ्गाणां भूयसामिह प्रतिपादनात्, अतो बृहत्त्वादारण्यकत्वाच्च बृहदारण्यकम्, Ānandagiri on Br.Up.-*bhāṣya*, I.1.1.
4. सलिल एको द्रष्टृद्वैतो भवत्येष ब्रह्मालोक, Br.Up. IV.3.32.
5. अहं ब्रह्मास्मि, I.4.10; यत् साक्षादपरोक्षादब्रह्म य आत्मा सर्वान्तरः, III.4.1; ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्माप्येति, IV.4.6; तमेव मन्य आत्मानम्, IV.4.17; स वा एष महानज्ज आत्मा खरोऽमरोऽमृतोऽभयो ब्रह्म, IV.4.25; स वा अयमात्मा ब्रह्म, IV.4.5; अयमात्मा ब्रह्म, II.5.19.
6. Br.Up. III.4.1.
7. See *Anubhūtiprakāśa* of Vidyāraṇya: Ch. 17, vv. 81-83, pp. 425-426 (Advaita Sabha, Tiruchirapalli, 1984):
सर्वान्तर्यं ब्रह्मणो योग्यं तच्च जीवात्मनिरितम्।
मुख्यापरोक्ष्यं जीवस्य योग्यं ब्रह्मणि वर्णितम्॥
अभेदो वास्तवो जीवब्रह्मणोर्व्यत्ययादतः।
विवक्षितः तत्प्रसंगात् वादिव्यामोह आर्थिकः॥
आत्मनो ब्रह्मता मुख्या ब्रह्मणोऽप्यात्मता तथा।
प्रत्यग्दृष्टया, पराग्दृष्टया मिथो ब्रह्मात्मनोर्भिदा॥
8. आत्मैवास्य ज्योतिर्भवतीति, आत्मनैवायं ज्योतिषास्ते, IV.3.6; आत्रायं पुरुषः स्वयं ज्योतिः, IV.3.9.
9. न हि द्रष्टृद्वैतः विपरिलोपो विद्यतेऽविनाशित्वात्, IV.3.23.
10. यद्वै तन्न पश्यति पश्यन्वै तन्न पश्यति, IV.3.23.
11. Br.Up. IV.3.23. Cf. also न दृष्टेर्द्रष्टारं पश्ये, III.4.2.
12. अथात आदेशो नेति नेति न ह्येतस्मादिति नेत्यन्यत्परमस्ति, II.3.6.

13. तं त्वौपनिषदं पुरुषं पृच्छामि, III.9.26.
14. इन्द्रो मायाधिः पुरुरूप ईयते, II.5.19; यदेव जाग्रदभयं पश्यति तदत्राविद्यया मन्यते यत्र देव इव राजेवाहमेवेदं सर्वोऽस्मीति मन्यते सोऽस्य परमो लोकः, IV.3.20; एवमेवायमात्मेदं शरीरं निहत्याविद्यां गमयित्वा, IV.4.3.
15. इदं सर्वं यदयमात्मा, II.4.6.
16. यत्र वा अस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्तत्केन कं जिघ्रेत् केन कं पश्येत्, II.4.14.
17. *ibid.* II.4.14.
18. *ibid.* IV.4.19.
19. *ibid.* IV.4.19.
20. *ibid.* II.3.6.
21. *ibid.* II.3.6
22. यदा सर्वे प्रमुच्यन्ते कामा येऽस्य हृदि श्रिताः। अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवत्यत्र ब्रह्म समश्नुत इति। तद्यथाहिनित्वं यनी वल्मीके मृता प्रत्यस्ता शयीतैवमेवेदं शरीरं शेतेऽथायमशरीरोऽमृतः प्राणो ब्रह्मैव तेज एव, IV.4.7.
23. त्रयं वा इदं नाम रूपं कर्म, I.6.1 and *Bhāṣya* thereon, संसारस्य नामरूपककर्मात्मकतैव।
24. श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्यः, II.4.5.
25. Śaṅkara's comments are worth noting in this context:
आगमप्रधानेन मधुकाण्डेन ब्रह्मतत्त्वं निर्धारितम्। पुनः तस्यैव उपपत्तिप्रधानेन याज्ञवल्कीयेन काण्डेन पक्षप्रतिपक्षपरिग्रहं कृत्वा विगृह्यवादेन विचारितम्। शिष्याचार्यसम्बन्धेन च षष्ठे प्रश्नप्रतिवचनन्यायेन सविस्तरं विचार्योपसंहृतम्, Br.Up. IV.5.1.
Sureśvara holds that *jalpa* mode of reasoning is adopted in the 3rd chapter and *vāda* mode in the 4th chapter, Br.Up. *vārtika*, IV.5.2:
जल्पन्यायेन तत्पूर्वं पञ्चमे प्रतिपादितम् ।
वादन्यायेन तदभूयः षष्ठे सम्यक् प्रपञ्चितम् । ।
26. तस्माद् ब्रह्मजिज्ञासोपन्यासमुखेन वेदान्तवाक्यमीमांसा तदविरोधितकौपकरणं निःश्रेयसप्रयोजना प्रस्तूयते, Śār.Bhāṣya, I.1.1; तदर्थग्रहणदार्ढ्यायानुमानमपि वेदान्तवाक्याविरोधिप्रमाणं भवन्न निवार्यते। श्रुत्यैव च सहायत्वेन तर्कस्याभ्युपेतत्वात् “श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्य” इति श्रुतिः पण्डितो मेषावी गन्धारानेव, *ibid.* I.1.2.
27. Br.Up. III.1.1.
28. The meaning of the *mahāvākya* अहं ब्रह्मास्मि, I.4.10, the meaning of Brahman's entry in स एष इह प्रविष्टः आनखाग्रेभ्यः, I.4.7; self-luminosity of the self आत्मनैवायं ज्योतिषा, IV.3.6; अत्रायं पुरुषः स्वयंज्योतिः, IV.3.9; on *vṛttijñāna* and *svarūpajñāna* I.4.10; III.4.2 and IV.3.23.
29. यां काण्वोपनिषच्छलेन सकलाम्नायार्थसंशोधिनीं संचक्रुर्गुरुवः, introductory verse to the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣya-vārtika*.

TUMBURU

Tumburu's name is a very popular name in India. Several stray verses ask to stop his music because the hero is not well. His name is profusely found in Indian Literature whether Sanskrit,¹ Pali or Prakrit. Generally he is classed under a Yakṣa² or a Gandharva³ class in Buddhist,⁴ Jain⁵ or Hindu literature. His name is found in the *Rāmāyaṇa*,⁶ *Mahābhārata*,⁷ *Kūrma-purāṇa*,⁸ *Bhāgavata*,⁹ *Padma-purāṇa*,¹⁰ *Garuḍa*¹¹ and *Viṣṇudharmottara*. His basic characteristic as an expert in music is maintained every where. Besides being a Gandharva,¹² a race born for music, his voice was very sweet and mellifluous. To demonstrate his proficiency there is a *rāga*¹³ installed after his name. His music could be heard on a full-moon day from the top of the Gandhamādana mount.¹⁴ He was a member of the court of Indra or Sakka or rather a leader of the musical troupe.¹⁵ He was also a member of the *Kuberasabhā*.¹⁶ His association with *pañca-sīkha* is universally accepted and demonstrates the fact of his being an exponent of Sāṅkhy-Yoga systems.¹⁷ His name is also referred to as an expert in Yoga.¹⁸ He is associated with Nārada.¹⁹ He is also known as Nāda-sīva.²⁰ He is known as *parama-bhāgavata* in Vaiṣṇava literature as he along with Nārada sang worshipful songs adoring Viṣṇu.²¹ Tumburu is also a founder of a Tantric School.

His name is included in the list of Ṛsis of the *Sāmaveda* as well of the Black *Yajurveda* for *tarpaṇa*,²² libation of water with

mantra. Inclusion in the list of *tarpaṇa* means he must be a historical figure and not merely a mythological personality. That he could inflict curses and be an object of wrath is very much in the nature of Indian ethos.

Biography:

Tumburu was the son of Kaśyapa,²³ son of Marīci and a grandson of Brahmā. Pradhā was the name of his mother.²⁴ The *Mahābhārata* names Bāhu or Viśvabāhu, Hāhā, Hūhū, as his brother.²⁵ His daughter Lalitā was married to Pañcaśikha.²⁶ The name of his wife was Raṁbhā.²⁷ He loved his wife dearly because of his blind love, Kebera inflicted a curse upon him. He was a friend of Anu.²⁸

The cursed Tumburu became demon Virādha. The *Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa* reports of killing of Virādha by Rāma. Here Virādha narrates his story of the curse to him in his former life as Timburu and that the termination would be effected by his getting killed at the hands of Rāma.²⁹ Sometimes his mother's name is given as Ariṣṭā.³⁰ He had two daughters named Manovatī and Sukeśā.³¹ He had two friends Candanodaka and Dundubhi.³² Sometimes Candanodaka is read as Candrodaka.

The *Kathāsaritsāgara* gives the story of Urvaśī and Purūravā and states how they were separated by a curse of Tumburu. The *Viṣṇudharmottara* also narrates.³³

The *Mahābhārata* gives some details of his association with Pāṇḍavas, he came to witness the coronation of Kṛṣṇā performed by Indra and Kāmadhenu.³⁴ He came to see the battle when Arjuna protected the cows of the Kauravas.³⁵ He was also present at the time of Horse sacrifice by Yudhiṣṭhira.³⁶ He awarded 100 horses to Yudhiṣṭhira.³⁷ He welcomed Arjuna when he came to heavens at the invitation of Indra.³⁸ He also praised Hiranyakaśipu when he became Indra.³⁹ Pāṇini IV.3.104 makes him a disciple of Kalāpin.

Expert in Music and Dance:

The *Kūrma-purāṇa* gives a list of 12 Gandharvas and his name tops the list.⁴⁰ The *Padma-purāṇa* refers to him as an expert in the *nāda-tattva* 'essence of basic cultivated sound'.⁴¹ The *Saṅgitarāja*

refers to him with respect in *Svara* chapter.⁴² He was the teacher of Urvaśī.⁴³ *Tambūrā* an Indian musical instrument is named after him. There is a *rāga Tumburupriyā* named after him demonstrative of his creative genius in music.⁴⁴ On dance his views are quoted by Abhinavagupta in *Nāṭyaśāstra* under the topic *Tāṇḍava* for *recaka*⁴⁵ exposition. The *Nṛttaratnāvali* also quotes his views.⁴⁶

Jain Literature:

Jain literature refers to him as a devotee of Jina. In the *Sthānāṅgasūtra* 404 and 582 he is enlisted among the musicians attending the court of Indra. The *Tattvārthābhigama-bhāṣya* reads Tumburu as a synonym of Gandharva class. In the same way *Āvaśyaka* or *Sadāvaśyaka-sūtra* reads his name as a synonym for Jakkha or Yakṣa.⁴⁷ He is attendant of the nineteenth Arhat of the present Avasarpinī.

Tumburu's Religion:

He was a member of the court of Kubera, Yakṣa chief. Yakṣas are normally Śaivas (*Harivaṃśa* 13131). He is the regent of the Northern quarters (Megh. II.8). Himālaya is supposed to be place of Śiva where Kailāsa is situated.

Gandharvas are born from Viṣṇu.⁴⁸ He is mostly associated with Nārada in singing praise of Viṣṇu. He also sang praise of Kṛṣṇa, when he lifted the mount Govardhana. He was a devotee of Lord Veṅkaṭeśvara, the *Veṅkaṭācalamāhātmya* narrates. A temple without Tumburu and Nārada is of medium and not respectable nature.⁴⁹

He was a founder of a Tantra school.

The inscription of Sdok kak thom in Cambodia (about 1052 A.D.) speaks of the court priest Śiva Kaivalya of the king Jayavarman II established a royal cult at the beginning of the ninth century based upon the doctrines of four Tantric books brought from elsewhere (India) by Hiraṇyadāman.

The *Netratantra* puts forward a division into three currents Dakṣina - Vāma - Siddhānta associated with three manifestations

of Śiva-Bhaira-Tumburu- Sadāśiva. The Vāma or the left current of Tumburu dominates by a group of female attendants led by Jayā, so he is a vāma, left current tantric also.⁵⁰

Places associated with Tumburu:

Tumburu is associated with two spots. One is Gaṅgāsāgara-saṅgama⁵¹ and the other is Tirumala mountain at Tumburu-tīrtha. The *Veṅkaṭācala-māhātmya* in the *Skānda-purāṇa* gives a story to propagate the efficacy of the religious bath in the Tumburu-tīrtha during the month of Māgha. On the full-moon day in the month of Phālguna a bath⁵² is more merit-yielding.

After the conclusion of the first *Brahmotsvam* all the saints, gods, etc., who came to witness the festival retired; but in spite of being told to withdraw he sneaked to stay on some 10 miles away to the north of the temple. Of course, the scenic beauty of the spot is heart-captivating. Subsequent to his stay the pond was named as Tumburu-tīrtha.

Because of Tumburu's stay the spot has become more sanctified and one devotee of Veṅkaṭeśvara, Tarikoṇḍa Veṅkamāmbā earned a great fame as a spiritual figure of the 19th century. She really possessed some poetic powers and composed many works both original and translations, though said to be illiterate or semi-literate. Rāmalakṣmaṇadās, a brother of Mahanta Prayāgadās also practised penance here.

The *Viṣṇudharmottara-purāṇa* makes Tumburu presiding deity of the Sun's chariot. The *Garuḍa-purāṇa* also confirms the same:⁵³

Month	Caitra
Name of Āditya	Dhātā
Name of Ṛṣi	Pulastya
Name of Gandharva	Tumbura
Name of Apsaras	Kṛtusthala
Name of Sarpa	Vāsuki

2nd Tumburu:

There might be another figure named as Tumburu also a Gandharva. He was the son of Subāhu and Munikanyā. He had two daughters Manuvamśī and Sukanyā.

3rd Tumburu:

In the *Sṛṣṭi-khaṇḍa* of the *Padma-purāṇa*⁵⁴ there is a mention of a Rākṣasa of this name. In the battle against Hiraṇyakaśipu he was killed by Vāyu. Of course in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, 4.16-19, he was transformed into Rākṣasa and ultimately after being killed by Rāma he regained his original form.

REFERENCES

1. रुच्यन्मन्त्रमृत्तश्चमत्कृतिपरं कुर्वन्मुहुस्तुम्बुरुं
ध्यानादन्तस्थं नन्दनमुखान् विस्मापयन् वेधसम्।
औत्सुक्यावलिभिर्विलिं चटुलं भोगीन्द्रमाघूर्णयन्
मिन्दन्पण्डकटाहभित्तिमथितो बभ्राम वंशीध्वनिः॥
Rādhāmādhavacintanam, p. 647, Gita Press edn.
2. Yakṣas in Buddhist literature are found as guardian figures or *dvārapālas*. Particularly at Sanetu they are also introduced as teachers of good morals. In Jain literature (*Jīva-cintāmaṇi*) the yakṣas are propitiated for progeny and prosperity. They are tutelary deities between gods and the inferior beings. In the *Uttarajjhayana-sūtra*, III.14-18 yakṣas are said to be born as human beings when their merits get expanded. Manu. XI.96 speaks that yakṣas take meat and alcoholic drinks. Gita. X.23 clubs yakṣas and rakṣas. In XI.22 four classes are enumerated: गन्धर्वयक्षासुरसिद्धसंघाः। Śāṅkara has गन्धर्वा हाहाहूह-प्रभृतयो, यक्षाः कुबेरप्रभृतयः, असुराः विरोचनप्रभृतयः, सिद्धाः कपिलादयः। and in XVII.4 it is said that the yakṣas and the rakṣas are worshipped by people of *rajas* disposition. In *Gītā*. X.23: वित्तेशो यक्षरक्षसाम् and in X.26: गन्धर्वानां चित्ररथः is said thus maintaining a difference between the two classes, one led by Kubera and the other Citraratha. *Yakṣarātri* means *dīpāvali*, *yakṣa-sīlā* means a woman who loves intoxicating drink, perfumes and meat and Bharata adds another quality as *ratī-priyā*. The *Kena-upaniṣad* penetrates into the origins of yakṣa. The *Viṣṇu-purāṇa*, 1.5.46 says gandharvas are born of Viṣṇu.

3. तुम्बुरुर्नरदो हाहाहूविशवावसुस्तथा
उग्रसेनो वसुरुचिर्वा वसुरथापरः॥
चित्रसेनस्तथोर्णायु धृतराष्ट्रो द्विजः।
सूर्यवर्चा द्वादशैते गन्धर्वा गायतां वराः॥ *Kūrma*. 1.40.12-13.
4. चित्रसेनो च गन्धब्बो नलो राजा जने सभो।
आगा पञ्चसिखो चैव तिम्वरु सुरियवच्चसा॥
Dīghanikāya. p. 193, Bhikhu Jagadish Kasyap edn.
5. गोमुखो महायक्षो त्रिमुखो यक्षनायकः।
तुम्बुरुः कुसुमश्चापि मातंगो विजयो जयः॥
ब्रह्मायक्षेशकुमारषण्मुखपातालकिन्नराः।
गरुडो गन्धर्वो यक्षेशकुमारो वरुणोऽपि च॥
भृकुटिगोभिषपाश्वो वा मातङ्गो हि उपासकाः। *Rūpamaṇḍana*, VI.12-13.
6. अभिशापादहं घोरां प्रविष्टो राक्षसीं तनुम्।
तुम्बुरुर्नामगन्धर्वश्चरत्तो वैश्रवणेन हि॥ *Vālm̐ki-Rāmāyaṇa*, 3.2.12.
7. MBh. 1.122.54; 2.52.24; 3.43.14; 4.56.12; 14.88.39, etc.
8. *Kūrma-purāṇa*, 1.40.12-13 enumerates 12 gandharvas which includes the name of Tumburu at the top.
9. *Bhāgavata*, V.25.8, VII.4.14; X.24. 20; X.27.24.
10. *Padma-purāṇa - Svarga*, 7.21.
11. *Garuḍa*, 1.58.7; 70.16; 70.20; 70.22; 139.44.
12. गायन्तोऽग्रांसमुत्पन्ना गन्धर्वास्तस्य तत्क्षणात्। *Viṣṇu*, 1.5.46.
13. गान्धारांशो मध्यम्यासो निषनश्च सप्तमध्वनिकः।
धैवतषड्जापेतो रागः स्यात्तुम्बुरुप्रियः - नान्यः॥
गान्धारांशो निषादान्तो मध्यमन्याससंयुतः।
षड्जधैवतनिर्मुक्तो विज्ञेयस्तुम्बुरुप्रियः॥ कश्यपः।
14. MBh. 3.159.29.
15. *Sthanaṅga-sūtra*, para 582 Sabha 7.14.
16. Sabha 10.26.
17. ललितां तुम्बुरुसुतां ददौ पञ्चशिखाय स पद्मस्वर्गः। 78.26.
In Buddhist records her name is recorded as Bhadda-suriya-vacassa.
18. सधूतपापा मनुगौतमादयः सकौशिकास्तुम्बुरुपर्वताद्याः अगस्त्यमार्कण्डसपिप्पलाद्याः सगालवा योग-परायणाश्च। *Brahmapurāṇa*, 174.3, p. 901.
19. *Bhāgavata*, 1.13.37; 1.13.57; 5.25.8; 10.27.24.
20. तुम्बुरुर्नरदश्चापि देवानामपि वल्लभौ।
नारदरूपी शिवः साक्षात् अतः तत्त्वविदौ हि ते॥ *Padma - Svarga*. VII.21
21. A list is given in the *Mānavagṛahya-pariśiṣṭa* attached to *Maitrāyaṇīya-śākhā*.

22. सुमन्तुर्जैमिनिपैलवैशम्पायनाः सशिष्याः भृगुच्यवनाप्नवानौरवजामदग्न्याः सशिष्याः आंगीरसाम्बरीष-
यौवनाश्वहरिदुष्ठागलिर्लवयतुम्बुरु औलेयपायनाः, etc.
23. *Bhāgavata*, 12.11.33.
24. *Padma - Ādi*, III.37.
25. MBh.1.66.51.
26. See note 18 above.
27. MBh. 5.115.400, line 4.
28. कपोतरोमा तस्यानुः सरवा यस्य च तुम्बुरुः, *Bhāgavata*, 9.24.2.
29. 3.5.1; 2.16; 3.16-19; 5.12..
30. MBh. 1.66.51.
31. मनोवती सुकेशा च तुम्बुरोस्तु सुते उमेः *Vāyu*, 69.49.
32. तस्यासीतुम्बुरुसखा विद्वान्युत्रोऽभवत्किल।
ख्यायते यस्य नाम्ना स चन्दनोदकदुन्दुभिः॥ *Vāyu*. 96.117.
33. 1.31.5; *Viṣṇu-dharmottara*, 1.129.19; 20b-21a.
34. *Bhāgavata*, 10.27.24.
35. MBh. 4.56.12.
36. MBh. 14.88.39.
37. MBh. 2.52.24.
38. MBh. 3.43.14.
39. *Bhāgavata*, 7.4.14.
40. See note 8 above.
41. See note 21 above.
42. *Saṅgītarāja*, p.264 on *Svara*.
43. अनयत्तां ततः स्वर्गं देवीं बालमृगेशणाम्।
शिष्यत्वे प्रददे त्वेनां गन्धर्वस्य च तुम्बुरोः॥ *Viṣṇudharmottara*, 1.129.19.
सच्चिष्या त्वं च तुम्बुरोः। *ibid.* 1.129.24.
44. See note 14 above.
45. *Nāṭya-sāstra* 4.248 and *Abhinava-bhāratī* thereon.
46. *Nṛttaratnāvali*, 4.374, p.156.
47. *Sadavasyaka-sūtra*, p.19.
48. *Viṣṇu-purāṇa*, 1.5.44.
49. The inscription has been edited by L. Finot in *Bulletin de l'Ecole Francaise d'Extreme Orient*, Paris, 15, 1915, p. 53-106 and by G. Coedes and Dupont in BEFEO 43, 1943-46, p.57-134 with a French translation. Also T. Goudrian, 'Tumburu and His Sisters', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens*, Wien, 17, 1973, p.49-95.
50. तुम्बुरुनारदाभ्यां यक्षविद्याधराभ्यां हीनं मध्यमम्, *Vimānārcanakaḥ*, p 94.

51. *Brahma-purāṇa*, 174.3, p. 901.
52. *Varāha - Uttara*, 1.66-68 and *Skānda - Venkaṭācalamāhātmya*, 26.43-80.
53. *Viṣṇudharmottara*, 1.82.40; *Vāyu*, 52.3; 36.47; *Viṣṇu*, 2.10.3; *Bhāgavata*, 12.11.33.
54. *Padma - Sṛṣṭi*. 75.

P.V. PARABRAHMA SASTRY

SANSKRIT IN THE INSCRIPTIONS OF ĀNDHRADEŚA

Although we notice few Sanskrit inscriptions in the Ikshvaku period,¹ Sanskrit as the language of the royal charters is noticed from the latter half of the fourth century A.D. Samudragupta invaded Āndhradeśa sometime about 360 A.D. It is a landmark in the history of Andhra in more than one respect. In the first place, the Gupta king removed several petty kings and installed in their place some new kings with the objective of popularising the cult of the *Purāṇas* through their patronage. It was his intention to check indirectly the unopposed growth of Buddhism in the society at large both in his own land of Magadha and Andhra in the South. It is believed that the *Purāṇas* were re-edited and made suitable for preaching brahmanical *dharma* among the masses. Secondly, Sanskrit scholars for the purpose of spreading *sanātana-dharma* were patronized by settling them in *agrahāras*. Thirdly, Sanskrit was made the language of documents in the royal courts. The early Pallavas, the Śālaṅkāyanas and the kings of Kalinga began to issue their gift deeds in Sanskrit only. There are instances where some earlier Prakrit records seem to have been redrafted after rendering them into Sanskrit. In this early stage of Sanskrit usage we notice, an enthusiastic attempt to Sanskritise even some Telugu names of villages, tanks, rivers and gods wherever possible. The place name Veccavāḍa or Peccavāḍa, for example, became Bejjavāḍa or

Vijayavāḍa. Veccavāḍa in Telugu means 'a place of commercial transactions' and it has been woven with the legend of Vijaya's, i.e. Arjuna's, penance for *pāśupatāstra*. The village name Yenamadala is rendered into Sanskrit as Mahiṣaśira-grāma, i.e. *yenumu* + *tala* (buffellow's head). The river name Pennā became Pinākinī. Ceyyeru has been translated as Bāhudā, with a legend that certain prince whose hands were cut off for some crime, got back his hands when he bathed in the river. Another interesting process, we notice, in translating the name of a tank called Nallaceruvu in Telugu as Kamsāri-taṭāka in Sanskrit,² because *nalla* means black = Kṛṣṇa and Kṛṣṇa is Kamsāri, i.e. the enemy of Kamsa. The river Krishna with its original Telugu name Nalla-beṇṇa, is called in Sanskrit Sitetara-beṇṇa in the Chezerla inscription of Pallava Mahendra Varman³ and as Kanha-beṇṇa in the Hāthigumpha Prakrit inscription of Khāravela⁴ of the first century B.C. and finally in full Sanskrit as Kṛṣṇavenī.

Identification of the proper places becomes difficult at times when twisting of the real meaning is made in the process of Sanskritisation. But in the Cālukya period, they have realised the difficulty and wrote the proper names as they were in vogue saying like: *sīmā-liṅgāni likhyante deśa-bhāṣayā spaṣṭārtham*. Even Nannayabhaṭṭa in the Nandampūḍi Sanskrit grant uses the Telugu term *reṇḍerula-naḍimi-viṣaya* for *sindhuyugmāntara-viṣaya*, that is, the region between the two rivers.

All the copper plate charters issued by the Viṣṇukunḍi and the Eastern Cālukya kings were generally composed in Sanskrit prose and occasionally some descriptions of the donors or donees occur in verse. The imprecatory portions are generally taken from the *Purāṇas*, as *vyāsa-gītas*. The dynastic eulogies contain almost a set phraseology uniformly adopted by all members of a particular family, with little deviations, if any; e.g.:

(a) Eastern Cālukyas:

स्वस्ति। श्रीमतां सकलभुवनसंस्तुयमानमानव्यसंगोत्राणां
हारितीपुत्राणां स्वामि महासेनपादानुध्यातानां भगवन्नारायणप्रसाद-
लब्धवरवराहलाञ्छनेक्षणक्षणवशीकृतारातिमण्डलानाम् अश्वमेधावधु-
थस्नानपवित्रीकृतवपुषां चलुक्यानां....।

(b) Eastern Gaṅgas:

स्वस्ति। श्रीमतामखिलभुवनविभूतनयविनयप्रसादानदाक्षि-
ण्यसत्यशौचशौर्यधैर्यादिगुणानां महेंद्राचलशिखरप्रतिष्ठितस्य
सकलचराचरगुरोः सकलभुवननिर्माणैकसूत्रधारस्य शशांकचूडामणेः
भगवतो गोकर्णस्वामिनः।

(c) The Vaidumbas:

स्वस्ति। अनेकसमरसंघट्टनोपलब्धजयलक्ष्मीसमालिङ्गित-
वक्षस्थल.... ।

The charters of the Early Pallava, the Śālaṅkāyana, the Early Eastern Cālukya and the Eastern Gaṅga rulers are only official gift deeds, with little or no eulogies containing the achievements of the individual rulers. We notice in the early period few *praśastī-kāvya*s like the Allahabad *Praśastī* of Samudragupta⁵ composed by Hariṣeṇa and Aihole *Praśastī* of Pulakeśin II⁶ composed by Ravikīrti. The Talguṇḍa inscription of Kadamba Śāntivarman⁷ is another example where his family *praśastī* along with his own meritorious victories which make him deserve to proclaim sovereign authority, is composed in chaste Sanskrit verse. Thus Samudragupta and Pulakeśin II by setting up the *Praśastī-kāvya*s indirectly proclaimed their acquisition of imperial status. Generally such *praśastis* of proclamations are incised on stone pillars called Victory Pillars or *jaya-stambhas*. To set up a *jaya-stambha* means in those days a challenge to other kings, in the same way as performing Aśvamedha sacrifice in the earlier period.

The reign of Guṇaga Vijayāditya (A.D. 848-892) the Eastern Cālukya king was an epoch making period in Andhra history in more than one aspect. Politically, he was a great conqueror and had the boldness to use the imperial emblem of Varāha for the first time on the royal seals and banners of the Eastern Cālukyas as a challenge against the mighty Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings. On the cultural side, it was during his time, we notice the early Telugu verses in the inscription set up by his general Paṇḍaraṅga at Addaṅki.⁸ In the Sanskrit inscriptions also Vijayāditya introduced the system of recording the chronological sequence with the respective regnal years of the preceding rulers of the Eastern Cālukya family. He issued the copper plate charters not as mere official documents

as before, but he got them composed in the form of small *Campū-kāvya*s with descriptive prose passages or verses wherever required. His *Sātulūru grant*⁹ is a political document which indirectly proclaims his unopposed sovereign status defying the authority of the *Rāṣṭrakūṭas*. It contains the following description about his grandfather Vijayāditya II and father Kali Viṣṇuvardhana, *alias*, Kali Viṭṭa.

गद्य। विजयादित्यः आदित्य इव संततोदयकारी। विन्ध्याटवीव सुवंशशताधारः। मेरुरिव सुवर्णांकृततनुः। हरजटामकुट इव गंगावप्रतिबन्धनसमर्थः। सुरपतिगज इव सततदानकरी। विष्णुरिव बलिपुमथनः। शेषमहानाग इव भूधरणक्षमभुजः। महाव्रतीव महाशंखध्वनि-विराजमानः। सकलगङ्गकुलगर्जज्जलदघटकोटिवित्रासनविशिष्टमारुतः। अपि च —

वृत्त। श्रीमद्धर्मस्य मूर्तिस्सुभटमधुपसदबोधनांभोरुहाभः
शौर्याग्न्युत्पत्तिबीजं प्रियवचनमणेरकरस्सर्वसत्त्वः।
कीर्त्तिश्रीवल्लभस्सत्कुलगृहममलं सत्यवाणी सत्कुमार्याः
विद्वदबृन्दस्य धाम प्रकटमवनिपो गोत्रनिस्तारकाङ्कः॥

अष्टोत्तरशतनरेन्द्रेश्वरदेवालयानां कर्ता द्वादशवर्षयुद्धं वल्लभेन्द्रदण्डनायकैस्सह भीम-सङ्केनेनाम स्वानुजं निर्जित्य गृहीतवैगिमण्डलश्चत्वारिंशद्वर्षाणि। तस्य सुतः॥

The above prose and verse are composed in *kāvya* style with the *alaṅkāras*, *upamā* and *śleṣa* to describe Vijayāditya II's good qualities of munificence and valour. The phrases *hara-jatāmakuṭa iva gaṅgārava-pratibandhana-samarthaḥ* and *sakala-gaṅgakula-garjaj-jaladaghaṭakoti-vitrāsanaviśiṣṭa-mārutaḥ*, particularly refer to his diffensive and offensive onslaughts on the Eastern and Western Gaṅgas who might have attacked him, being instigated by the Vallabhas or the *Rāṣṭrakūṭas*. Similarly the attribute *baliripu-mathanḥ* indicates his suppression of the Bāṇa chieftains who claim their descent from the demon king Bali of the *Purāṇas*. The simile *mahāvratīva mahāśaṅkhadhvani-virājamānaḥ* indicates his usage of the five great sounds of which blowing of the conch is one and his religious disposition towards that sect of Śaivism. It is stated in another passage that he got constructed one hundred and eight temples of Śiva to commemorate as many victories he won over the generals of the *Rāṣṭrakūṭas*. The verse describes his qualities of *dharma* (righteousness), capability to lead the warriors, valour, pleasing talk, pure abode of truthfulness and the patron of learned scholars. The next prose passage narrates the historical

events of his conquest of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa generals who came to assist his brother Bhīma Saḷuke in the latter's attempt to usurp the throne of Veṅgi-maṇḍala.

वृत्त। अरिन्पवाजिवारणपदातिमहाभ्रविराममारुतः

परकरसुस्थितासिभरुचिप्रविनाशनभानुसन्निभः।

गुरुतरदीनभागवतमानवमानितकल्पपादपः

वरकरिगल्लभूमिपभुजासिरिहाजिभुवि प्रहासते ॥

गद्य। कलिविद्वनामा वर्षार्धं। तस्य सूनुर्विजयादित्यः अनेकतुलाधृतसुवर्णदानधारासन्तर्पितब्राह्मणः
(.....) गुणवकेनल्लानिति जयगीयमानकीर्तिः सन्दक्षिणापथसत्रिकलिङ्गदेशमन्वपालया-
मास। एवं पञ्च विष्णुवर्धन नामानः द्वौ जयसिंहनामानौ एको मंगियुवराजः त्रयो
विजयादित्य नामानः। तत्र तृतीयविजयादित्यः द्वारि प्रतिष्ठापितगङ्गायमुनाचन्द्रादित्य-
पालिकेतनः समधिगतपञ्चमहाशब्दश्रवणवित्राणितचतुराशाश्चक्रे वराहलाञ्छनो
वीरमकरध्वजः ॥

Vijayāditya II's son and father of Guṇaga Vijayāditya III was Kaliviṣṇuvardhana or Kaliviṭṭabhūpa, who ruled Veṅgi for half year only. Perhaps much of his career might have been spent in assisting his father in the military undertakings. The following Sanskrit verse in *Campakamālā* metre draws our attention as it resembles a Telugu verse in that metre. It is noteworthy that the poet uses the *prāsa*, that is using the same letter in the second place of the first gaṇa in all the four pādas which is invariably observed in Telugu and Kannada *vṛtta* verses, but not in Sanskrit. Kaliviṣṇuvardhana's son and successor was Guṇakkenallān or Vijayāditya III who issued the Sātalūru grant at the request of his brother. Then follows the prose passage mentioning the names of all the previous rulers of the family in a consolidated manner. Vijayāditya III is described with the outstanding attributes. He set up the images of Gaṅgā and Yamunā on either side of the main entrance of the palace, besides the images of the sun and the moon, he set up the row of banners *pāliketana* and the most significant imperial emblem of the boar (*varāha*) as a mark of his acquisition of full sovereignty defying the authority of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Guṇaga's younger brother Nṛpakāma, being instrumental in getting the grant issued, is described as:

गद्य। सत्येन धर्मपुत्रः कर्णस्त्यागेन विक्रमेण हरिर्नृपकामः स्वाम्यनुजो विप्रेभ्योऽदीदिशदग्रामं।
पुनरपि सत्यवचनोऽयमसुरो न स सुराधिपभयादभवति सत्यवचनः शौर्यगुणवान् मृगपतिर्न

सविवेकमततो भवति शौर्यगुणवान् दानविभवो रविसुतो न स पतिस्वबलतो भवति
दानविभवः सत्यवरशौर्यपरदानविभवस्तु नृपकामनृपतिः प्रकृतितः ॥

King Guṇaga's younger brother named Nṛpakāma who was as great as Yudhiṣṭhira in truthfulness, as Karna in charity, as Viṣṇu in valour, got this grant issued by the king.

The next four lines are figurative in expression.

Nṛpakāma was truthful but not as the demon (Bali) who was so because of the fear of (Hari) the lord of the Devas. He was valourous but not as a lion, but with (viveka) 'discrimination' unlike the (animal) lion. He was charitable but not as Karna who was so at the expense of his (Karna's) master Duryodhana, Nṛpakāma in all these qualities is original by instinct.

Thus the whole inscription looks like a small *Campū-kāvya*. Taking this lead his successors got their charters composed with elaborate descriptions of the important rulers of the family and also the donors themselves. The Korumilli¹⁰ (IA. XIV, p. 49), Kalidindi (EI. XXIX, p.57), Nandampūḍi (EI. IV, p. 301) and Manda (*Pallavulu-Cālukyaulu*, p. 417)¹¹ of Rājarājanarendra are large in content and descriptive as *kāvyas*. Interestingly the Korumilli charter contains a lengthy description of the donee composed in Sanskrit language but in Telugu *deśi* metre *Ragaḍa* in 24 *pādas*, with *antya-prāsa* in all *pādas*, *ādi-prāsa* and *yati* in many *pādas*, although it is defective in some respects. Some specimen *pādas*:

तस्मै समस्तजनताविशेषगुणाय
रैसुतर्पितमहीदेवदेवगणाय।
जन्मप्रभृति गीतवेदान्ततत्त्वाय
सन्मनो वसति वास्तव्यात्मसत्त्वाय।
सिद्धनिजनायकृतसेवितमनीषाय
शुद्धमतिदूषितसमस्तजनदोषाय।
सतताराधितनिजस्वामिपादाय
चिंतितमनस्य सुखदाभूतपादाय।
सप्ततंतुकृतयूपस्तंभशोभाय
सप्ताश्वरूपसदृशात्मतनुलाभाय ॥

Indian rulers of the medieval period evinced keen interest in getting their great qualities and achievements composed as *Prasasti-kāvyas* in Sanskrit. The following inscriptional verses are worth nothing in this regard:

कुर्वन्तु कीर्तनशतानि रणांगणेषु
मथन्तु वैरिनिकरं धनमुत्सृजन्तु।
कालान्तरे तदखिलं प्रबलान्धकार
नृत्योपमं कविजनैरनिबध्यमानम् ॥¹²
काव्यामृतैर्वाथ कथामृतैर्वा
अद्यापि जीवन्ति मृता महीशाः।
पूर्वप्रसादात्कविपुंगवानां
नृपस्य यस्मात्कविरेव मित्रम् ॥¹³

The first verse states that whatever great victories, a king might achieve on the battle field by killing the enemies and make gifts of large amounts, in course of time all that greatness becomes invisible like a dance performance in thick darkness and unrecognised if those achievements are not composed as *kāvyas* by the poets.

The second verse states that the rulers of the past who died long ago are still living by means of the nectar-like literary compositions written in their praise by the poets. Hence the poet alone is his (king's) real friend (as he makes the dead king live forever by his poetical work). There was no royal court in those days where great poets and scholars of repute were not honoured.

Coming to the Kākatiya period, A.D. 1160-1323, we notice a good number of scholars, poets and their inscriptional *kāvyas* in Sanskrit. Only a dozen inscriptions are engraved on copper plates and several hundreds are incised on stones. A good number of them depict poetical beauties which draw our attention. Kākati Rudradeva proclaimed his independence in A.D. 1163, through his Pillar inscription set up in the Thousand Pillared Temple at Anumakoṇḍa.¹⁴ It is a small *kāvyā* composed by Acintendra-yati, son of Rāmeśvaradīkṣita, a *śrautin* and the disciple of Advayā-mṛtayati. The *kāvyā* begins with obeisance to the Goddess Sarasvatī as:

[जा]तेव दुग्धलहरीभिरुदञ्चतीव
दुग्धोदधेरमृतदीधितिनिमित्तिव।

श्रीखण्डपिण्डपरिपाण्डुरपुत्तलीव
वक्त्रे वसत्वविरतं तु सरस्वती नः ॥

The verse in *Vasantatilakā* metre with *Upamālaṅkaras* is in easy flow of expression.

The goddess *Sarasvatī* as if coming out along with the wavelets of milk, manifesting herself out of the milky ocean, made of the brilliance of the nectar and looking like the white toy figure made of sugar, may always remain in our mouth.

This verse is intended to pray the goddess *Sarasvatī* to remain in the poet's mouth, produce sweet words and pleasing ideas in his attempt of composing the inscription. *Rudradeva's* battle field is described in the following verse:

पादन्यासशिलाशिशरांसि समरे कृत्तानि खड्गेन य-
च्छत्रूणां पतितानि मांसविलसत्पङ्केऽथ शङ्के ह्यहम् ।
रक्तस्रोतसि रुद्रदेवजयिनो नृत्यत्कबन्धाः प्लवाः
आयान्त्या विजयश्रियश्च सविधं कीर्तिः प्रयान्त्या दिशः ॥

The battle field of victorious *Rudra* is covered with the heads of the slain enemy kings which looks like the stepping stones in the mud of flesh and blood of the slain enemy warriors, the headless bodies with the moving hands and legs look like small boats with oars in the stream of blood. Both serve the purpose of to and fro movements of the goddess of victory to come to *Rudra* and the personified fame to go from *Rudra* to the cardinal points.

The figures obviously relate to *Atiśayokti* and *Utprekṣā*.

Rudradeva had a minister and military general named *Vellaki Gaṅgādhara* of *Ātreya-gotra*. He was a scholar, poet and devotee of the God *Keśava*. He set up some inscriptions at *Nagunūru* near *Karimnagar* and *Anumakoṇḍa*. Just one verse from them is illustrated here:¹⁵

संग्रामरंगाद्धतगन्धहस्तिमदांबुपूरैस्सुरभीकरोति ।
दासीव मेढक्षितिपाललक्ष्मीर्यस्यांगणं सिंचति निर्व्वलीका ॥

The goddess of fortune of the defeated enemy king Meḍarāja, like a maid-servant is sprinkling the threshold or front yard of Rudradeva's palace with sweet smelling water in the form of rut emitted by the elephants captured in the battle field.

Gaṇapatideva was an enlightened patron of scholars, poets and masters of arts and statecraft. It is said that he brought Jāyana while the latter was an young boy and got him trained in different branches of arts besides statecraft as said in the verse:

मन्त्री कार्यानिरूपणे प्रियसुहृद्विभ्रंभसंभाषणे
काव्यारंभविधौ कविः सहचरस्संगीतसंपादने।
कर्ता शिल्पकलाकलापविषये संप्रेषणे किंकरो
युध्दे यश्चलमर्तिगण्डनृपतेरग्रेसरो वर्तते॥

Jāyana served the king Gaṇapatideva (*calamartigaṇḍa*) in different ways. Gaṇapatideva's court was busy with a good number of poets and men of letters. His poet-laureate is known by the title *kavicaḥkravartin* who composed three or four inscriptions, viz., the Chebrolu inscription, the Pakala lake inscription¹⁶, the Kalavakolanu incomplete inscription and the Ganapeswaram inscription. He begins the Chebrolu inscription with obeisance to the diety of *Sārasvata* (rhetorics):

हंसाः पद्मासनासीनाः यदंतस्समुपासते।
परामृतरसस्यन्दिस्त्रोतस्सारस्वतं स्तुमः॥

Here the pun or *śleṣa* refers to swans sitting on the seats of lotuses and the ascetics who attain the position of *paramahansa* sitting in the posture of *padmāsana*, the former drinking the pure water of the stream of the Sarasvatī and the latter the nectar of *parāmrta*, that is the bliss of experiencing the Supreme Soul, Brahman. That kind of nectar like *sārasvata*, the poet wants to exhibit in his composition. The following verse is a specimen from his inscription:¹⁷

हस्तैरावृणुताननं मृगदृशो नो चेन्मुगांकभ्रमा-
नन्दन् कृन्तति पोतपात्रमुदधिस्तुंगैस्तरंगोत्करैः।
इत्थं यत्प्रतिभूभृतां प्रतिदिशं द्वीपांतरं गच्छतां
शुध्दांतप्रमदाः सभ्रीति सदयं शंसन्ति सायात्रिकाः॥

Consequent on their defeat at the hands of Gaṇapatideva, the enemy kings along with their ladies are stealthly fleeing their own lands in the cargo ships of the merchants to other lands (islands). The owner merchants of the ship politely asked those ladies to cover their (ladies) faces with their hands lest the ocean mistaking their faces as moon rises up with high tidal waves out of joy and breaks the ship (which may cause a great loss to them). With such condoling words of fear, because of their defeated king and compassion, because of the pitiable plight of the ladies. Again the merchants advise those ladies to cover their faces as a mark of their unfortunate grief. The *alaṅkāra* is a complex of *Nindāstuti*, *Vakrokti*, *Bhrāntimat* and few others.

There was a family of scholar poets of three generations of whom Īśvarārya of Ātreya-gotra, his son Mayūra-sūri and the latter's son Īśvara-bhaṭṭa are known from their inscriptions¹⁸ at Vardhamānapura and Bothpura in Mahbubnagar district. Mayūra-sūri is credited with the titles *padavākyapramāṇaprameyajña*, *vicitrakavitvatattvajña* and *abhinava-mayūra*. His original name is not known. Abhinava-mayūra was his title conferred on him after the great Mayūra-kavi. He describes his patron Guṇḍaya-senāpati as:

आकारतो रतिपतिः स्वयमेव योऽसौ
वीरः प्रचण्डचरितः परमेष भेदः।
अस्त्रीकरोति मदनस्समरांगणेषु स्त्री-
वीरानयंतु कुरुतेऽस्त्रधरानपि स्त्रीः ॥

He (Guṇḍaya) is verily like the God Manmatha in his physical appearance and the qualities of valour and courage, but the only difference is Manmatha makes the ladies his weapons in the war against the men, whereas Guṇḍaya makes even the valourous armed enemies (weak) as ladies.

He describes the lofty temple built by Guṇḍaya as:

आदौ यस्य निकामहेमशिखरं ज्ञात्वा समालोच्य त-
त्कोणैर्भानुरथावरोधनभयान्मार्गद्वयं वेधसा।
निर्माद्योत्तरदक्षिणायननिभादित्यं जगत्कल्पितं
नो चेत् क्षुण्णरथो रविः कथमिह स्पष्टं समावेष्टते ॥

The God Brahmā while creating the Sun and the path he has to traverse considered that in future there would be raised a lofty temple with golden *sīṭhara* which might obstruct his (Sun's) passage and made it (the path) in two ways, that is, for some months on its north side and some other months on its south side in the name of *Uttarāyana* 'winter soltice' and *Dakṣiṇāyana* 'summer soltice' otherwise he (the Sun) with an unchequered movement should change his path in two distinct routes.

There was another poet known by the title Bālabhārati in Gaṇapatideva's court. He composed the tank inscriptions at Kundavaram and Niḍigoṇḍa villages, in which he extols the fame of Kundamāmbā, the sister of Gaṇapatideva who got the tanks excavated:

सुस्निग्धलहरीरुचिजित्वरीषु
यत्कीर्तिषु प्रतिदिशं प्रतिसुत्त्वरीषु।
क्षीरोदगर्भवसतिः पुरुषोत्तमे न
साधारणी ध्रुवमभूज्जगती जनानाम्॥

When her (Kundamāmbā's) fame pervaded with its bright and dense rays all the directions the privilege of residing in the milky ocean does no more remain an exclusive privilege of the Lord Puruṣottama or Viṣṇu, because all the people in the world enjoyed that privilege.

One unnamed poet praises the God Śiva as:

अभीष्टफलदः स्थाणुरष्टमूर्तिरतीन्द्रियः।
कामारिरर्धनारीशो महादेवः स पातु वः॥

Although He is *sthāṇu* 'dried trunk of a tree' he bestows the fruits we want; although he manifests Himself in eight forms (*aṣṭamūrti*) he is beyond sensuous comprehension; although he is the enemy of the God of Love, he takes the form of half lady (*ardhanārīśvara*). Such great God may protect you.

Another unnamed poet praises the God Śiva with the crescent moon on his head as:

श्रेयस्तनोतु वः शंभुर्यन्मौळावैन्दवीकळा ।
धत्ते गतास्त्रपंचेषु मुक्तकार्मुकविभ्रमम् ॥

The God of Love having thrown all his five weapons against Śiva and being disgusted with His adamant attitude (towards Pārvatī) threw away, as a last attempt on Śiva's head the bow itself, which even now appears as the crescent of the moon.

Here the poet wants to express the folk idea in action, that is, Madana thinking that in spite of all his earnest attempts in pursuing Śiva to love and marry Pārvatī, the most beautiful lady of the universe, Śiva does not change his adamant attitude and as an act of disgust Madana threw away the bow itself on his head.

There was one great scholar named Viddanācārya in the time of Pratāparudra (A.D. 1289-1323). He wrote a book named *Prameyacarcāmṛta*:

आदाय पूर्वोत्तरतंत्रसारमण्डुफयद्ग्रंथमकल्मषं यः ।
प्रैवेयकं वागधिदेवतायाः प्रमेयचर्चामृतनामधेयम् ॥

Having taken the essence of both *Pūrva* and *Uttara tantras*, likely *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā* and *Uttara-mīmāṃsā*, he wrote the faultless book entitled *Prameyacarcāmṛta*, which adorns the Goddess of learning as necklace.

Viddanācārya seems to have composed the *Uttarēśvara grant*¹⁹ and the *Khaṇḍavalli grant*.²⁰

There are some other unnamed writers of inscriptions during the Kākatiya period whose compositions are embellished with ornate style and mellifluous Sanskrit with a variety of figures of speech.²¹

REFERENCES

1. EI. XXXIV, p. 202 (Ābhīra Vasuṣeṇa's 30th year); *ibid.* XXXIII, p. 149 (Ehavula Chāntamūla's period).
2. Cf. Bobbepalli plates of Pallava Kumāra Viṣṇu, EI. XLII, p. 53, ll. 15-16.

3. SII. VI, No. 594.
4. EI. XX, pp. 72ff., text, l. 4.
5. CII. III, pp. 6ff.
6. EI. VI, pp. 4-5.
7. ibid. VIII, pp. 31ff.
8. ibid. XIX, pp. 271ff.
9. JAHRS. V, pp. 1ff.
10. IA. XIV, p.53, D.V. Avadhani, *Prāññanayayugamu I*, p.318 (Telugu).
11. N. Venkataramanayya, *Pallavulu* and *Kalyulu*, pp. 404ff (Telugu).
12. EI. XXVIII, p. 281.
13. ibid. XXXV, p. 168.
14. IA. XI, pp. 9ff.
15. *Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh*, Warangal Dist., p. 124.
16. ibid. pp. 203-211.
17. EI. V, pp. 142ff.
18. *Telamgāṇaśāsanaṃ*, II, p. 107 (Telugu).
19. EI. XXXVIII, pp. 78ff.
20. Ep. Andhrica, IV, pp. 115ff.
21. For more particulars see my book: *Kākatīya-śāsana-sāhityamu* (Telugu), published by Andhra Sarasvata Parishat, Hyderabad, 1981.

SATYA PAL NARANG

THE CONCEPT OF VIVARTA IN BHARTṚHARI AND ŚAṆKARA

The main object of this paper is to explore the concept of vivarta in Śaṅkara and compare it with the concept of Bhartṛhari who had been a predecessor Vedāntin of monistic school: of course, different in approach and concepts of the reality and object. It will also help to interpret Bhartṛhari in true light because the commentators had been trying to impose Advaita of Śaṅkara on him. Sometimes, from the internal evidences of both Bhartṛhari and Śaṅkara it appears that they inherited a common source and the common source is quoted verbatim with a colour of different philosophies on them. It also appears that the Śabda philosophy which is found in the Veda,¹ the Upaniṣad,² the Nyāya and the Mīmāṃsā sūtras was so dominant that Śaṅkara had to strive hard to refute. The grammarians also tried to establish themselves by identifying Śabda with Brahman³ to the extent that Bhartṛhari fully explored and established the doctrine of Śabda-brahman.⁴ The foundation of Bhartṛhari was so firm and appealing to every system that he is quoted as the authority not only by grammarians but also frequently by philosophers of all systems: Advaita, Viśiṣṭādvaita, Dvaita, Nyāya, Mīmāṃsā, aesthetics and mystic-aesthetics like those of Abhinavagupta and Somanātha multifariously.⁵ The Sphoṭa doctrine was interpreted variously by different systems and the systems who found it in consonance with their doctrines put it in *prima-facie* to refute it.

In this paper, I shall restrict myself to the concept of *vivarta* in Bhartṛhari I.1 and Śaṅkara. The internal evidences will be helpful in coming to the true meaning.

It appears that Śaṅkara had a full knowledge of the doctrine of Bhartṛhari, viz. the Śabdabrahman and Sphoṭa.⁶ Although the object of Śabdabrahman philosophy is also salvation (*apavarga*),⁷ the concepts and objects of Bhartṛhari are different from those of Śaṅkara.

Śaṅkara's Vivarta:

Śaṅkara has explained the doctrine of Vivarta in various contexts of Avidyā, Pariṇāma and Adhyāsa through various similes like *mṛgaṭṛṣṇa*, 'snake and rope', 'conch-shell and silver', dreams, Māyā and spider. The commentators tried to explain and contribute to these contexts in a variety of ways to establish Advaita doctrine and refute other systems. The concept is so indirect in Śaṅkara and mixed with other concepts of Adhyāsā, etc. that even the lexicographers⁸ quote other authorities instead of Śaṅkara.

Avidyā:

The main object of the doctrine became the removal of illusion (*bhṛāntī*) and subsequently the Avidyā.⁹ Bhartṛhari also thinks that the concept of Avidyā which is found in the concepts like *Devatā*,¹⁰ i.e. the *de facto* conceptual Reality is not found in Vidyā, that is the Ultimate Reality. It is only for analysis of the object¹¹ that the Avidyā comes into existence which is the real purpose of Bhartṛhari in contrast to the concept of Śaṅkara who thinks it unreal. But ultimately both Bhartṛhari and Śaṅkara move from Avidyā to Vidyā.

Pariṇāma:

Śaṅkara thinks that the analogy of the earth and pot cannot be applied in case of the Brahman which shall become contradictory in the case of Ultimate Reality in which the creation appears only as an illusion. This doctrine called *pariṇāma-vāda* was already holding good amongst Naiyāyikas and Sāṅkhyas and of course amongst a few Vedāntins. It was accepted by grammarians also and a full

system (āmnāya) is quoted by Bhartṛhari who thinks that the world is a transformation (pariṇāma) with Śabda-brahman as material cause. The *Bhāmātī* has refuted in details the pariṇāma-vāda of the Sāṅkhya. Vṛṣabhadeva thinks that pariṇāma is a synonym of vivarta through *lakṣaṇā*.

The *Bhāmātī* explains that a homogeneous element comes out of the cause, e.g. the thread out of the spider shall be just like the spider; the rope shall be like the snake. The heterogeneity (*virūpa*) cannot come into existence; e.g. the rope cannot be transformed to an elephant.

In this context, Śaṅkara has written a line which clearly indicates to the strong doctrine that śabda is the material cause which not only proves the doctrine of Bhartṛhari before Śaṅkara beyond doubt but also explains both the vivarta and its relationship to the creation of the world. In his opinion, a few predecessors think that 'Śabda is a material cause like the Brahman is a material cause of the universe.'¹² Perhaps the line I.1 of the *Vākyapadīya*, viz. *prakriyā jagato yataḥ* is in his mind where the full context is that of Śabdatattva, its vivarta in meaning and the creation of the universe from it in the form of the material cause. That is why the full tradition of commentators explained it either in the form of *pariṇāma* or in the form of an evolute which does not give up its former form and has a resemblance with the Sāṅkhya doctrine. Śaṅkara has quoted an anonymous *mantra* which is not traced but has a strange parallel with the *Vākyapadīya*, I.1:

anādinidhanā nityā vāgutsṛṣṭā svyaṃbhuvā/

ādau vedamayī divyā yataḥ sarvā pravṛttayaḥ//

where the parallel is that of *anādinidhanā* verbatim (*anādinidhanam*); *vak* with *śabda* and *yataḥ sarvāḥ pravṛttayaḥ* with *prakriyā jagato*. Śaṅkara has himself used the word *prakriyā* in the sense of evolutes in terms of material and effect relationship (Śaṅkara on II.1.14: *mṛdaiva tu mṛdanvitā vikārāḥ prakriyante suvarṇena tu suvarṇānvitāḥ*).

Elsewhere, Bhartṛhari (VP.II.233; III.14.78) is also of the opinion that with the instruments of the different *prakriyās* only Avidyā is explained; but Vidyā is far beyond that. The word *śabdabrahman*

is found in a number of later Upaniṣads including the *Maitrāyaṇī* and the *Bhagavadgītā*¹³.

To this Śaṅkara replies: the existence from the Śabda is not a reality but since the word, meaning and their relationship is eternal which is a doctrine of Patañjali,¹⁴ it is only for practical expression.¹⁵ This objection is found verbatim in the *Svopajñavṛtti* of the *Vākyapadīya*,¹⁶ which again proves that Śaṅkara is alluding to the full tradition including Bhartṛhari in *prima-facie*.

For the defence, Śaṅkara relies on the eternity of the relationship of word and meaning which is itself a doctrine of grammarians who think that the analysis of the word (*apoddhāra*) as real. That is why to face this strong argument, he had to place his shield of *vyavahāra* in contrast to *prātibhāsika* existence which is the Ultimate Reality to both Advaitins and the grammarians.

In this context, Śaṅkara has placed another argument in *prima facie* and quoted another *śruti* to prove that the creation is preceded by the Śabda.¹⁷ He has refuted it on the ground that these words are not universal but are applicable only to a few sects only.¹⁸ Moreover, an object if it is itself *anādinidhana*, i.e. has neither the beginning nor the end, how can it create another creation.¹⁹ He quotes the *Manusmṛti* that all the names and actions were created by the Ultimate Reality from the *Veda-śabda*.

It appears that it is only due to the similarity of the word *śabda* in the *Smṛti* and in the *Vākyapadīya* that Śaṅkara is trying to divert the issue of Śabdabrahman to *vedaśabda*. In the *Manusmṛti*, the Veda is a basis of all the institutions and not the Śabda.²⁰

Regarding the material cause, the *Bhāmati* has explained the stand of Vedāntins, viz. the serpent and the rope are different entities but it is only by *vivarta* in the rope that the snake is generated, similarly it is due to the *vivarta* in Paramātman that the world is generated and not due to its being material cause.²¹ Here Śaṅkara accepts the meaning 'illusion' and not 'transformation'. But Mādhavācārya in his *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*²² has accepted the stand of Śaṅkara differently which was found in the *Svopajñavṛtti*²³ of Bhartṛhari as well, viz. taking a different form

without giving up its prior form. Vṛṣabhadeva had to interpret it as *pariṇāma* through *lakṣaṇā*.²⁴ So there had been two traditions amongst Vedāntins also; but Śaṅkara was a follower of the tradition of 'illusion'.

Adhyāsa:

Superimposition is another instrument which was accepted by Śaṅkara to prove the qualities of 'x' on 'y' as unreal and hence only illusory but generating the *karṣṭva* and *bhokṣṭva*.²⁵ Bhartṛhari accepts it in mind which is responsible for change from one number to many numbers.²⁶

Ābhāsa:

It was another doctrine to establish the relationship of the Paramātman and the *jīva* which just like the relationship of the Sun and its reflection in the small quantity of water; but at the same time which is unreal is an excellent instrument of Śaṅkara.²⁷ It was accepted by the *Brahmasūtra* II.3.50 and explained variously by full tradition of commentators.

Although Śaṅkara through Ābhāsa, tried to prove that the reflectory object is unreal, yet 'one real object in many different objects' is interesting in the context of the *vivarta* of Bhartṛhari. It is like one air and various tunes of the musical instrument or one water in various bottles of various sizes and colours. Śaṅkarians tried to impose the conch-shell simile on it.²⁸ The playwright Bhavabhūti²⁹ also accepted the same meaning, viz. one *karuṇa-rasa* takes different forms due to various reasons including context.

Bhartṛhari's *vivarta* in *Vākyapadīya* I.1 can also be explained as 'an undecaying object *Śabdātattva* transforming into various meaning or one full existing meaning or object (*artha*) with double entendre. Besides these doctrines, Bhartṛhari has accepted the doctrine of *adhyāropa*³⁰ and *upaplava*³¹ also which is explained as illusion by the commentators.³²

Similes:

In order to prove the world unreal, Śaṅkarians use the following similes:

i. *Mṛgatṛṣṇodaka*:³³ Śaṅkara thinks that as the water in *mṛga-trṣṇa* is only reflectory and unreal, the Brahman is real and *jīva* only a reflection.

ii. The simile of the rope and the serpent: It also demonstrates the Brahman as real and the world as unreal.³⁴

iii. Dream:³⁵ The dream simile is very interesting and real because it not only creates the illusion but also real actions after sleep. It is accepted by Śaṅkara, and Bhartṛhari also accepts the same position. viz. both as illusion and reality. According to Śaṅkara, as a person feels the biting by the snake in the dream which is unreal but after the sleep also this sense continues. The concept of the prediction and its real fruit is found in the *Chāndogyopaniṣad* (V.2.9) and it is seen amongst astrologers as well. It proves that sometimes with the untrue objects, the truth also comes into existence.

This situation is most suitable to Bhartṛhari who thinks that Śabdabrahman is real but every conceptual meaning is equally real and valid and not illusion although Bhartṛhari has collected a number of similar similes.

***Alātacakra*:**

Besides these similes, Bhartṛhari has given a simile of *alātacakra* also³⁶ which is found in the *Maitrāyaṇi-upaniṣad* VI.24 and frequently in the *Gauḍapāḍakārikā*.³⁷ Bhartṛhari has given the simile in the context of untouchable entity.³⁸ A fiction has clearly been distinguished from the Reality through the simile of the *gandharvanagara* in the *Vākyapadīya*.³⁹

Word as origin:

After discussing the *autpattika* relationship of the word and the meaning, Śaṅkara discusses the possibility of its origin from the Vedic *śabda*. The prima-facie places the objection that if you have already established that the world comes into existence from the Brahman (vide *Brahmasūtra* I.1.2), how is it possible that it should come from the word?⁴⁰

As stated previously, the Śabdabrahmavādins were known even in the Upaniṣads who propound the Śabdabrahman as the origin of the universe both as material and the efficient cause.

Śaṅkara has refuted it on the basis of an experience to everyone in this world. In his opinion, firstly a desired object comes to our mind (*cikitsitam artham*); then the expressive word (*vācakaśabda*) and only then the meaning at last (*arthānuṣṭhāna*). He has quoted here the *Taittirīya-brāhmaṇa* (II.2.4.2) where the utterance of Prajāpati's *Vaidika* word '*bhūḥ*' gave birth to the 'earth' directly, which was accepted by Śabdabrahmavādins as the direct cause of this universe.⁴¹ Śaṅkara has also accepted a distinction between eternal word (*nityaśabda*) which is the origin of the concept like Deva, etc. But the varṇa or letters or articulated letters are born and destroyed. They appear different in different persons.⁴² Perhaps this is the *vivarta* of Bhartṛhari which has a relationship with meaning as well as the word

Before Śaṅkara, Bhartṛhari had already accepted the procedure of comprehension of meaning from the letters directly (*vivartate 'rthabhāvena*) which is indirectly refuted by Śaṅkara that it is not logical that the letters give birth to meaning (*na ca varṇebhyo 'rthāvagatir yuktā*) which should be read with the above line that the letters are born and destroyed and their pronunciation should be different from one person to another (*pratyuccāraṇam anyathā cānyathā ca pratiyamānatvāt*).

This applies to Bhartṛhari in the context of both letters and meaning if we interpret them as : *vividham vartate iti vivartaḥ* which has been accepted in details in Bhartṛhari that even the most expert person in the language cannot comprehend the meaning intended by another person.⁴³ The tradition of the *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad*⁴⁴ also proves the same and it continued even later upto Bhavabhūti who was acquainted with this tradition of the word and meaning.

Śaṅkara also does not accept them as illusion because they generate a definite knowledge which may be different from object.⁴⁵ But he is against the doctrine that 'each and every letter gives a particular meaning which are born in serial and joined together

communicate the meaning'. He is totally against the Sphoṭa doctrine.

Śaṅkara has fully utilized the doctrine of the grammarians, viz. *nityaśabdārthasambandha*.⁴⁶ He thinks that *dravya*, *guṇa* and *karma* are the qualifications of an individual and not that of genus. Words have relationship with genus and not with the individual. Bhartṛhari⁴⁷ has also indirectly acknowledged the *Mahābhāṣya* for this doctrine which might have been the original source of both Bhartṛhari and Śaṅkara. Śaṅkara has refuted the Sphoṭa doctrine also in this context.

Comparison:

In fact, both Śaṅkara and Bhartṛhari are trying to establish a synthesis of various contradictory doctrines. There is a difference in their approach. Śaṅkara tries to interpret all the Vedic texts clearly propounding the Dualism in favour of Monism through 'illusion'; but the object of Bhartṛhari is different. Moreover, Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* is a compendium or a manual of various thoughts which have been collected from various sources and hence appear contradictory. Sometimes he moves from Universal Reality (Śabda-brahman) to an individual reality (*śabda*), or from non-sequential reality (*akrama*) to sequential reality (*sakrama*),⁴⁹ but his object, viz. grammatical analysis (*apoddhāra*)⁵⁰ intervenes (sometimes he tries to move from difference (*bheda*) to non-difference (*abheda*) also).⁵¹ At a number of places, he has clearly expressed that his object is the removal of the difference (*bhedāpoḥa*).

Śaṅkara does not compromise below 'Brahman' as the Ultimate Reality. But Bhartṛhari recognizes the 'stages', i.e. the first stage to second stage of reality till the Ultimate Reality as the final stage.

Interpreting these doctrines and reading them in a synthetic manner in the *Vākyapadīya*, one can come to the conclusion that *vivartate* in the Bhartṛhari should be interpreted as "real transformation into many" where both Śabdabrahman and *śabda*, including *varṇa* and meaning, are real. How a grammarian who divided his work in grammatical categories can afford that the *śabdā*s are unreal? Here Śaṅkara changed the thought and interpreted *vivarta* as illusion to propound Brahman as the Ultimate Reality and the world as illusion.

REFERENCES

1. RV. X.71.
2. Maitrāyaṇī. VI.22: शब्दब्रह्म परं यत् and अन्यथा परं शब्दवादिनः। For further details see: Jacob, G.A., *A Concordance to the Principal Upaniṣads and the Bhagavadgītā*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1971 (rpt.).
3. *Mahābhāṣya*, *Pāśpaśāhnika* - चत्वारि शृङ्गा, etc.: महता देवेन नः साम्यं यथा स्यादित्यध्येयं व्याकरणम्। Cf. *Udyota* महान् परब्रह्मस्वरूपो देवोऽन्तर्यामिरूपः शब्दः मर्त्येष्वविष्ट इत्यर्थः। Here Kaiyaṭa quotes the *Vākyapadīya*, I.131: अपि प्रयोक्तुं आत्मानं शब्दमन्तरवस्थितम्। प्राहुर्महान्तमृषभं येन सायुज्यमिष्यते॥
“आह च - ‘चत्वारि शृङ्गा त्रयो अस्य पादा’ इत्यादि ऋद्धमन्त्रः। इह द्वौ शब्दात्मानौ कार्यौ नित्यश्च। तन्नान्त्यः सर्वेश्वरः सर्वशक्तिर्महान् शब्दवृषभस्तस्मिन् खलु वाग्योगवित् शास्त्रजशब्दज्ञानपूर्वकं प्रयोगेण क्षीणपापः पुरुषो विच्छिद्याहङ्कारग्रन्थीनत्यन्तं संसृज्यते” इति तदर्थं तदव्यारव्यातारः।
4. *Vākyapadīya* [VP], I.1: अनादिनिधनं ब्रह्म।
5. *ibid.* ed. Abhyankar and Limaye, Appendices III-VII.
6. cf. fn.2 & 3 above.
7. VP. I.14, 131-132.
8. Roth and Böhrtlingk, *Sanskrit Wörterbücher*, Monier Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, p.988, where he mixes up vivarta-vāda and pariṇāma-vāda; *Nyāyakośa*, p. 777.
Originally it had a meaning ‘revolving’ whirlpool, turning round, rolling, etc., but later took the meaning of ‘changing from one state to another’; but in Vedānta it took an absolutely technical meaning which mixed up with other doctrines in different systems of Indian Philosophy; see: q.v. vivarta and vāda in *Nyāyakośa*. The ‘turning’ or ‘revolving with any object’ is the meaning of vivarta. See q.v. akṣa-vivarta in *Ghatage Encyclopaedic Dict.*
9. *Brahmasūtra*, II.1.14.
10. VP. III.9.62.
11. शास्त्रेषु प्रक्रियाभेदैरविद्यैवोपवर्ण्यते।
अनागमविकल्पा तु स्वयं विद्योपवर्तते। *ibid.* II.233.
12. न चेदं ब्रह्मप्रभवत्वमुपादानकारणाभिप्रायेणोच्यते।, *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* [=BSB], I.3.28.
13. Jacob, *Concordance*, q.v. śabdabrahman.
14. *Mahābhāṣya* - *Pāśpaśāhnika*: सिद्धे शब्दार्थसम्बन्धे ।

15. स्थिते वाचकात्मना नित्ये शब्दे नित्यार्थसम्बन्धिनि शब्दव्यवहारयोग्यार्थव्यवितनिष्पत्तिः। BSB. I.3.28.
16. VP. I. Vṛtti.1 (ed. K.S. Aiyar).
17. BSB. I.3.28.
18. सम्प्रदायप्रवर्तनात्मको द्रष्टव्यः अनादिनिधनाया अन्यादृशस्योत्सर्गस्यासम्भवात्। ibid. I.3.28.
19. ibid.
20. नाम रूपं च भूतानां कर्मणां च प्रवर्तनम्।
वेदशब्देभ्य एवादौ निर्ममे स महेश्वरः॥ ibid.
Cf. सर्वेषां तु स नामानि कर्माणि च पृथक् पृथक्।
वेदशब्देभ्य एवादौ पृथक्संस्थाश्च निर्ममे॥ *Manusmṛti*, I.21.
21. तस्मात् परमात्मविवर्ततया प्रपञ्चस्तद्योनिः, भुजङ्ग इव रज्जुविवर्ततया तद्योनिः, न तु तत्परिणामतया, *Bhāmatī* on BSB. I.2.21.
22. *Nyāyakośa*, see q.v. *vivarta*.
23. तत्त्वादप्रच्युतस्य वस्तुना भेदानुकारेण असत्याविभक्तान्यरूपोपग्राहिता विवर्तः, VP. I.1, Vṛtti.
24. Muralidhara Pandey, *Śāṅkarāt prāgadvaitavādaḥ*, p.210.
25. BSB. I.1.1; II.3.50; *Kalpataru-parimala* on BSB. I.1.1.
26. बुद्धिस्थितेषु तेष्वेवमध्यारोपो न दुर्लभः।
परधर्मस्य न ह्यत्र सदसत्त्वं प्रयोजकम्॥ VP. III.11.10.
27. BSB. II.3.50.
28. एको रसः करुण एव निमित्तभेदात्, *Uttararāmacarita*. cf. VP. III.7.37ff.
निमित्तभेदादेवैकाभिन्ना शक्तिः प्रतीयते षोढा। कर्तृत्वमेवाहुस्तत् प्रवृत्तेर्निबन्धनम्। यत् पृथक्त्वमसन्धिर्गन्धं तदेकत्वान्न भिद्यते। यदेकत्वमसन्धिर्गन्धं तत् पृथक्त्वान्न भिद्यते।
29. VP. III.11.10; Helārāja explains: अर्थजातीनां गोत्वादीनामात्मसु तस्याः शब्दजातः समारोपस्य कल्पना न परमार्थः।
30. VP. III.8.55.
31. द्रव्यमात्रेऽपि निर्दिष्टे चन्द्रवक्त्रेऽनुगम्यते।
विशिष्ट एव चन्द्रस्थो गुणो नोपप्लवादयः॥ VP. III.14.416.
32. Helārāja explains: उपप्लवः बाह्यविषयप्राबल्यम् उदकस्यैव सरजस्कत्वम्, ibid.
Cf. Devasūri (quoted in Abhyankar & Limaye, op.cit. App.V.): अपगमनादिभ्रान्तिरूपः। अयमेव व्यवहारस्य निमित्तम्।
33. यथा च मृगतृष्णिकोदकादीनामूषरादिभ्योऽनन्यत्वं दृष्टनष्टस्वरूपत्वात् स्वरूपेणानुपा-
रव्यत्वात् एवमस्य भोग्यभोक्तादिप्रपञ्चजातस्य ब्रह्मव्यतिरेकेणाभाव इति द्रष्टव्यम्, BSB.II.1.14.
34. BSB.II.1.14 & *Bhāmatī* on I.2.21.
35. ibid.
36. VP. I.130; II.291; III.8.8.

37. अलातस्पन्दितं यथा; अस्पन्दमानमलातम्; अलाते स्पन्दमाने नालातं प्रविशन्ति ते and न निर्गता अलातात्ते, *Gauḍapāḍakārikā*, IV.47-50 (quoted in: Jacob, Concordance).
38. स्पर्शबन्धो हस्तेन यथा चक्रस्य संततः।
न तथाऽलातचक्रस्य विच्छिन्नं स्पृश्यते हि तत्॥ VP. II.291.
39. वप्रप्राकारकल्पैश्च स्पर्शनावरणे यथा।
नगरेषु न ते तद्वत् गन्धर्वनगरेष्वपि॥ *ibid.* II.292.
40. BSB. I.3.28.
41. Jacob, Concordance, q.v. *śabdabrahman*.
Cf. *Maitrāyaṇī*. VI.22: शब्दब्रह्म परं च यत्; अन्यथा परे शब्दवादिभिः। *Gītā*, VI.44: शब्दब्रह्मातिवर्तते and the later Upaniṣads like *Brahmabindu*: शब्दब्रह्मणि निष्णातः, शब्दाक्षरं ब्रह्म, etc.
42. उत्पन्नध्वंसिनश्च वर्णाः प्रत्युच्चारणमन्यथा चान्यथा च प्रतीयमानत्वात्, BSB. I.3.28.
43. यत्नेनानुमितोऽप्यर्थः कुशलैरनुमातृभिः।
अभियुक्ततरैरन्यैरन्यथैवोपपाद्यते॥ VP. I.34.
44. तेनेशितं कर्म विवर्तते ह, *Śvetāśvatarpaniṣad*, VI.2.
45. न चायं वर्णविषयोऽन्यथात्वप्रत्ययो मिथ्याज्ञानं बाधकप्रत्ययाभावात्, BSB. I.3.28
46. See fn. 14 above.
47. नित्याः शब्दार्थसबन्धाः समाम्नाता महर्षिभिः।
सूत्राणां सानुतन्त्राणां भाष्याणां च प्रणेतृभिः॥ VP.I.23.
48. BSB. I.3.28.
49. VP.III.8.14.
50. *ibid.* I.24. Also cf. अर्थविभागहेतु or अर्थावच्छेदहेतु, VP. II.314-316.
A factor which determines the intended sense out of the various senses that arise in mind (Abhyankar and Limaye, op.cit., pp. 232, 235). Of course, Bhartṛhari accepts it as *avidyā* (II.234) and illusion (*mithyā*) as well (II.235). In *apoddhāra* also he talks of the sentence (VP. II.269) and meaning both internal and external (VP.II.432). Also cf. *viveka*, VP.II.433 and *vikalpa* (II.116).
51. VP. III.7.144,151,153 & III.8.1ff.

M.SRIMANNARAYANA MURTI

GREEN REVOLUTION IN THE VĀLMĪKI RĀMĀYANA

The historicity of the *Vālmīki-Rāmāyaṇa* can be demonstrated with success, even in the absence of physical evidences in the form of archaeological remains and epigraphs, by removing the mythological elements and by comparing the socio-religious institutions of the *Rāmāyaṇa* with those obtained in the Vedic literature. Any change in a social institution or in a religious practice is a watermark for absorption of new modes of life and adaptability to the varying situations and an indication of the natural flux in the evolution of culture. This change is the characteristic feature of the Indian cultural heritage and provides evidences for the evolution of the ancient India from nomadism to domiciliation. For example the direct and symbolic references to the agricultural operations and implications in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, read together with the same in the *Suklayajurveda* and its *gṛhya-sūtras*, reveal green revolution in the post-saṃhitā period and its impact on the socio-religious institutions in the following periods. The expression 'green revolution' implies extensive agricultural operations through deforestation by felling trees and bringing the land under cultivation, by the result of which the village and urban settlements of domiciliary nature appeared in the communities.

I

We shall consider this phenomenon, against the background of the following incidents in the *Vālmīki-Rāmāyaṇa*:

1. Vālmīki was residing in a hermitage in the forest on the bank of the river Tamasā, a tributary of the Gaṅgā.¹
2. Daśaratha went out for hunting and by mistake he killed the son of a sage and received a curse.² In fulfilment of the curse he had children and finally died because of separation from his son Rāma.
3. Daśaratha's close friend Romapāda, the king of Aṅgadeśa, gave away his daughter Śāntā in marriage to the permanent forest dweller Ṛṣyaśṛṅga.³
4. Daśaratha performed the Aśvamedha sacrifice on the northern bank of the river Sarayū,⁴ in which Vasiṣṭha and Ṛṣyaśṛṅga participated.⁵
5. Viśvāmitra took away Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa to his hermitage called Siddhāśrama⁶ which was lying in the forest between the city-capitals of Ayodhyā and Vaiśālī,⁷ ruled over by the descendants of Ikṣvāku. On the way Viśvāmitra gave accounts of different hermitages and acquainted the heroes of the problems prevailing in the hermitages caused by the sacrifice destroying demons.
6. Certain demons (like Mārīca, Subāhu, etc.) were disturbing the sacrifices of Viśvāmitra when they were started. He could not use his martial arts during consecration.⁸ So he taught all the missiles and weapons to Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa.⁹
7. After the sacrifice was completed in the forest¹⁰ Viśvāmitra took Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa to Mithilā.¹¹ On the way they visited the city Vaiśālī and received the hospitality of its Ikṣvāku king Sumati.¹²

8. When Rāma saw the deserted hermitage of Gautama in the outskirts of Mithilā¹³ on one side of the road leading from Vaiśālī he asked the reason for its being abandoned.
9. Viśvāmitra narrated the story of Ahalyā.¹⁴ Ahalyā was seduced by Indra when Gautama was absent in the house. As a protest he left the hermitage making it deserted¹⁵ so that there was none to see or hear Ahalyā.¹⁶ When Rāma came others also came and thus the mute Ahalyā was heard and seen by others. Till such time the hermitage was left uncared for.
10. They entered into the city capital of Mithilā. King Śīradhvaja¹⁷ Janaka informed that Sītā was seen in the furrow, while he was tilling the land with a plough (sīra).¹⁸ Thus she was named Sītā and adopted her as his own daughter. Hence he decided to marry her to a kṣatriya prince at a bride-price.
11. Janaka was having a bow of Śiva¹⁹ and this was broken and made unusable permanently.²⁰
12. Janaka had a brother called Kuśadhvaja, who was ruling over another city kingdom Sāṃkāśya lying close to Mithilā.²¹
13. Ayodhyā was lying at a distance from Mithilā, which could be reached by a horse ride for four days or three nights.²² The messengers were sent. The bridegrooms' party responded the invitation and the marriage took place.
14. In the marriage ceremony Janaka addressed Rāma:
*iyam sītā mama sutā sahadharmacārī tava/
 praticcha caināṃ bhadraṃ te pāṇiṃ gṛhṇīṣva pāṇinā//*²³

It is followed by *pāṇigrahaṇa* 'taking hold of the hand of the bride by the bridegroom'²⁴ and some rituals like circumambulation (*pradakṣiṇa*) to fire, etc.²⁵

15. Janaka gave *kanyā-dhana* 'bride-wealth' comprising of cattle, carpets, silk garments, a contingent of troops, a band of female slaves, ornaments made out of gold, pearls and diamonds.²⁶

16. The brides were sent to Āyodhyā along with the marriage party of Daśaratha.²⁷
17. On the way Paraśurāma encountered. Paraśurāma was overpowered and his *Viṣṇu-dhanus* was handed over to Varuṇa, the Lord of *ṛtam* 'order'.²⁸
18. The newly married pairs entered into Ayodhyā. They first went to the temple of gods (*devatāyatana*) and then entered into their bedrooms to enjoy nocturnal pleasures.²⁹
19. Daśaratha desired to coronate Rāma.³⁰ But Kaikeyī wanted that Rāma should repair to forest for a period of fourteen years and Bharata should be coronated.³¹
20. Rāma entered into the forests. The sages offered affectionately hospitality by offering fruits, flowers, roots, etc., and requested to protect them from the sacrifice-destroying demons.³² They pleaded that they were not in a position of using their weapons against their enemies for their preoccupation in the mendicant way of life, and that Rāma being a kṣatriya with the same resolve and duties should do the job, irrespective of being his residence in the forest.³³
21. Rāma moved on from hermit to hermit³⁴ until he settled down at Pañcavaṭī.³⁵
22. Rāma destroyed all the sacrifice-destroying demons to such an extent that Rāvaṇa despatched his troops to remove the scare among the demons living in the forest and to kill Rāma.³⁶
23. The beautiful Śūrpaṇakhā was disfigured by Lakṣmaṇa by scratching the ears and nose.³⁷ To avenge this insult, she reported to Rāvaṇa that Sītā was very beautiful by her nose and other limbs and recommended that Rāvaṇa could take her as his wife.³⁸
24. Rāvaṇa left the palace and on his way he found several mendicants leading a śrāmaṇic life like the Vaikhānasas and Vālakhīlyas.³⁹ There were many trees and water sources.⁴⁰

25. Rāvaṇa abducted Sītā and the eagle Jaṭāyu prevented Rāvaṇa in vain.⁴¹
26. Rāvaṇa kept Sītā in the Aśokavana and gave her one year time to make up her mind to be his wife. He warned that she would be handed over to the palace cooks to prepare breakfast cutting her into pieces, in case she did not concede to his demand after lapse of one year.⁴²
27. During his search for Sītā, Rāma met Śabarī - a śramaṇī - and received her hospitality in the Mātāṅgavana on the bank of the river Pampā.⁴³
28. Hanumān saw the well organized flora in the Aśokavana.⁴⁴
29. Sītā loved the forest life so much that she wanted to go on holiday to the forest during her pregnancy⁴⁵ and thus she was left to the care of Vālmiki,⁴⁶ who was living in the hermitage lying on the bank of Sarayū. Sītā gave birth to twins Lava and Kuśa.⁴⁷
30. Vālmiki brought Lava and Kuśa to Rāma's Aśvamedha sacrifice⁴⁸ and they sang his poem Rāmāyaṇa.⁴⁹ Sītā ended her life by being embraced by the mother Earth.⁵⁰

Now let us examine the historicity of these events and how they refer to green revolution by taking into account the socio-religious practices available in the Vedic literature.

II

The Vedic society - as known from the *Keśi-sūkta* (RV.10.136) in the *R̥gveda*, Rohita's episode in the *Aitareya-brāhmaṇa* (33.3), the *Āruṇaketukāgni* ritual in the *Taittirīya-āraṇyaka* (1.23) - was originally of migratory type, with a belief in ceaseless walking (*śramaṇa* < PIE. * \sqrt{kram} 'to move') as a religious practice.⁵¹ The practitioner is called 'śramaṇa' and the religion śrāmaṇism. The śrāmaṇic society is further characterized by maintaining oneself on whatever that is obtained on their way in the nature. The fruits, honey, meat of the deer, fowls, etc., were their main means

of sustenance.⁵² Further they were propitiating gods by offering oblations to the gods through the medium of air, water and fire.⁵³ In course of time, along with the preponderance of worship of gods through the fire, the sacrificial culture called 'yajñāism' arose accompanied by domiciliation through which the Āryan settlements became immanent against the basic concept of śrāmaṇism. "The acquisition of property by aggression and colonization on the one hand, and the development of Fire-sacrifice on the other led to the evolution of two groups among the Vedic Āryans. When one group adhered to the śrāmaṇic tradition of nonpossession and asceticism, and to live on with the nature with out disturbing it, the other group following modernity in material prosperity developed agriculture and cattle. Because of establishing their sovereignty (*kṣatra*)⁵⁴ these domiciliary Āryans came to be called *kṣatriyas*. Further these *kṣatriyas* through their supremacy and dominion obtained by accumulated wealth encouraged for making the sacrificial ritual more complicated by involving large number of priests and sacraments. They sought the help of the śrāmaṇic Āryans who were living in isolation in the outskirts of cities, in deep forests or on the river banks to develop those sacrifices.⁵⁵ Thus several manuals called *Brāhmaṇas* were written on the science of sacrifice and thus these śrāmaṇic Āryans came to be called *brāhmaṇas* 'brahmins',⁵⁶ in contradistinction to the *kṣatriyas*. These brahmins were always brought into the service of the *kṣatriyas* as priests at very lucrative *dakṣiṇās* 'fees' for performing sacrifices for them. Therefore the distinction of the brahmin and the *kṣatriya* arose in a natural way from within one group of people bound by identical destiny and belief."⁵⁷

The yajñāism gave way, in a natural way, for the introduction of farming, horticulture and animal husbandry. RV. 4.57, a hymn of Vāmadeva Gautama, is in praise of personified gods in relation to agriculture, namely *kṣetra-pati* 'the master of the field' (1-3), *śuna* 'share' (4), *śunāsīrau* 'the share and the plough' (5-8), and *sītā* 'the furrow' (6-7), are invoked for high yield and easy agricultural operations. Indra is the Lord of water⁶⁰ and agricultural produce. Hence the seer prays: "May Indra take hold of *Sītā*". By this she may well stored with water, yield it as milk.⁶¹

Felling of trees even for the creation of sacrificial altar is accompanied by a ritual in the form of prayer to the presiding gods of trees to forgive the sacrificer for destroying them.⁶² Slowly the felling of trees resulted in extensive cultivation and increased agricultural operations. The produce from such farm land is called *kṛṣṭapacya* 'grown by cultivation'.⁶³ Thus the *Jaiminiya-brāhmaṇa* 3.304.3 poetically compares the deforested land with hairless skin: *iyam vai prthivy ṛkṣevālomakāsīt* 'this earth is bare as it were hairless'.

With the change of times the brāhmaṇas living in forests depended on *akṛṣṭa-pacya* for their sacrifices and the kṣatriyas on the *kṛṣṭa-pacya*. Therefore, the *Taittirīya-saṃhitā*, *Kaṭha-saṃhitā* and *Maitrāyaṇīya-saṃhitā* record the distinction of the sacrifices of the brāhmaṇas and the kṣatriyas. For example the *darbha* grass which is grown wild in forests is used by the brāhmaṇas, while the *kuśa* grass which is grown in the cultivated fields is used by the kṣatriyas.

Further the brāhmaṇa sacrifices are characterized by performance of sacrifices in forests without causing any ecological disturbance⁶⁴ and condemnation of the sacrifices in a deforested land. The *Maitrāyaṇīya-saṃhitā* says *ṛkṣam vā amedhyam* 'a bare place is not fit for a sacrifice'. The kṣatriya sacrifices are characterized by erecting a sacrificial altar in the furrowed land; supporting this stand the *Maitrāyaṇīya-saṃhitā*, 1.6.9, 100.19 says *ṛkṣā vā iyam agra āsīt* 'the earth is in the beginning was bare'.

The *Śukla-yajurveda* and its *Kātyāyana-śrauta-sūtra* and *Pāraskara-gṛhya-sūtra* give more clues for the interpretation of the above mentioned historical facts of the Rāmāyaṇa. Preparing the sacrificial fire-place for the *Atirātra-Agnicayana* is a very important ritual to be performed. It is to be performed in a place not inhabited by human beings. Thus a site is chosen in the outskirts of the city or village. The trees in the selected area are to be felled and the ground is to be levelled by tilling with a plough harnessed to six, twelve or twentyfour oxen.⁶⁵ A set of hymns from the *Vājasaneyi-saṃhitā* (12.67-71) are to be recited in various stages of levelling the ground. The presiding deities of the trees are propitiated before felling them. The Vedic seer reacts regretfully to fell trees and repeatedly requests the divinities not to harm the digger

or feller of trees or the man for whom they are dug and not to attack with malady the biped or quadruped.⁶⁶ The tilled field, the plough, the plough share and the furrow are worshipped. *Sītā* 'the furrow' is worshipped in a special way. After tilling, the *kuśa* grass is spread in the furrow. Five ghee oblations are offered on the bundle of grass.⁶⁷ The whole field, whether ploughed or unploughed, is treated as the 'fire altar.'⁶⁸ Thus the *Vājasaneyi-saṃhitā* exemplifies the place of cultivation and farming in the Āryan society. So the same *saṃhitā* in hymn 18.14 makes a prayer that the sacrifice may bestow fire, water, creepers, plants, produce from cultivated lands, produce from uncultivated lands, domestic animals, etc., on the sacrificer.⁶⁹

In continuation to the plough ritual in the *Kātyāyana-śrauta-sūtra*, the *Pāraskara-gr̥hya-sūtra* (2.17) prescribes a sacrifice to the furrow called *Sītā-yāga*, to be performed by a married Āryan who is indulged in cultivation (*kr̥ṣi-pravṛtta*) and has kindled fire (*sāgnī*). This sacrifice has to be performed with rice if the cultivated produce is paddy, and with barley if the cultivated produce is barley.⁷⁰ Thus this ritual becomes applicable to the cultivation of paddy and barley. To the east or to the north of the field a clean spot is chosen for offering oblations of cooked mess (*sthālīpāka*) of rice or barley. It is elevated and smeared with cow-dung. It is sprinkled with water and *darbha* mixed with stalks of rice or barley, as the case may be, is strewn round the fire. Then fire is established. Two *ājya* portions and two *ājya* oblations are sacrificed with a group of five mantras; e.g. "In whose substance dwells the prosperity of all Vedic and worldly works, Indra's wife, *Sītā* I invoke. May she not abandon me in whatever work I do. *Svāhā*."⁷¹ Now on the *kuśa* grass, a *bali* 'propitiatory oblation (in air)' is offered to the protectors of the furrow (*sītā-goptr̥*). This *Sītā-yajña* can also be performed by option in the village also.⁷² Further it can be repeated any number of times and in repetitions either barley or rice can be used for making cooked mess, irrespective of the crop that is grown.⁷³

The *Gobhila-gr̥hya-sūtra* prescribes an interesting ritualistic procedure for the selection of a befitting bride to fulfil the aspirations of the Āryan community, according to which a girl is chosen as a bride for a given prospective bridegroom on her success in the 'auspiciousness test'. Nine balls of earth are made from

the soils collected from the Vedic altar, tilled furrow, water tank, cattle-shed, cross-roads, gambling house, crematorium, wasteland and a mixture of all the eight soils.⁷⁴ A girl who picks up any one of the balls made out of the first four soils shall be declared as fit to be a bride.⁷⁵ The *Gṛhya-saṃgraha* vouches that the girl who picks up the ball of the soil from tilled furrow shall bring prosperity in cultivation. She shall give birth to the offspring flourishing in agriculture. A girl who picks up the ball made out of the soil of the waste-land shall be a barren woman or a widow. But a girl who picks up the ball made out of all the eight soils possess all the qualities and may bring any of the results; thus she can be a symbol of prosperity or disaster to the family.⁷⁶ Hence some of the authorities in *gṛhya*-rituals recommend that one may take her as a bride at his discretion and choice.⁷⁷ The same ritual is given in brief in the *Āśvalāyana-gṛhya-sūtra* 1.5.5-6.⁷⁸

As found above in the *Gobhila-gṛhya-sūtra* different soils of earth are used in the ablutions (*snāpana* or *abhiṣeka*) of the deity in the temple worship. The soil at the root of the *darbha* grass is one of the eight soils of earth prescribed in the *mṛt-snāna* 'soil ablution' to the image of the deity.⁷⁹ Even though *darbha* and *kuśa* are ceremonial, *darbha* obtained value of auspiciousness and *kuśa* sacramental. *Drabha* grass is hung in the place of ablution as a mark of auspiciousness.⁸⁰ Similarly the pots of water are placed on the *darbha* grass.⁸¹ The *kuśa* grass is immersed in water and that water called *kuśodaka* is used for the ablution of the deity.⁸² A special ritual is prescribed to be performed, at the end of the worship of the deity, to propitiate Varuṇa, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Soma and Agni for cutting the *darbha* and *kuśa* grass from the ground for the purpose.⁸³ Thus the amalgamation of the śrāmaṇic and yajñaic rituals, as attested in the *Āruṇaketukāgni*,⁸⁴ is retained in the temple worship in all details.

III

The rituals of agriculture, the metaphorical treatment of the furrowed field as fire of worship in the texts of the *Śukla-yajurveda*, selection of the brides on the basis of soils of earth in the *gṛhya-sūtras*, and different narrations of *ayonijas* in the epics and the purāṇas confirm a necessary symbolic link of Sītā and Ahalyā of

the Rāmāyaṇa with the agricultural operations. To be denotative of a significant sense by exclusion (*paryudāsa*),⁸⁵ the word *ahalyā* presupposes the word *halya/halyā*⁸⁶ in usage. Pāṇini, Katyāyana, Patañjali and Jayāditya-Vāmana attest the use of words *sītya* and *halya* (mfn) as secondary derivatives from *sītā* and *halya* respectively.⁸⁷ *Sītya* denotes 'a field with furrows' and *halyā* 'a field tilled with a plough'. So *ahalyā* is 'an uncultivated arable land'. Thus the incidents of the plough cultivation of Janaka, adoption of the girl of unknown origin found in the furrow, desertion of the hermit by Gautama in fury, Śātānanda officiating as the priest to Janaka, breaking of the bow of Śiva - all of which have taken place in the city of Mithilā and its outskirts, and the nomenclature of Śīradhvaja, Kuśadhvaja, Sītā and Ahalyā foreshadow the promotion of farm culture on the one hand and the class conflict between the brāhmaṇas and kṣatriyas on the other. Rāma, Bharata, Lava and Kuśa represent total reconciliation of the conflicts among the brāhmaṇas and kṣatriyas and their ritualistic practices.

The very names Śīradhvaja and Kuśadhvaja to Janaka and his brother signify their commitment to agriculture and kṣatriya sacrifices. Further the description of Rāma's entering into Mithilā from Vaiśālī gives an impression that in the outskirts of Mithilā on one side of the road were laid paddy or barley fields, from where Sītā was found, and on the other in contrast the forest deserted by the brahmin Gautama. The forest land represents the ball of land made out of eight soils. So the deforestation and farming may or may not yield satisfactory results. So the land is called *ahalyā* in opposition to the *halya* 'ploughed' land on the other side of the road. Janaka dared to bring the land under cultivation and at once Gautama frowned at it and deserted the place. Gautama was partly in reconciliation; so he appeared with wet clothes, and *darbha* and *kuśa* bunches in hand before Indra who subdued Ahalyā.⁸⁸ As Indra is the lord of agriculture, Sītā is called Indra-patnī⁸⁹ and the king is called metaphorically Indra,⁹⁰ for he has to execute the farming of land. While one of his ancestors Vāmadeva Gautama composed a hymn in praise of anthropomorphic gods of agricultural implements and his son Śātānanda took the service of the king Janaka as a family priest, this Gautama appeared to be very obstinate to change until the reconciliator Rāma brought harmony between the brāhmaṇas and the kṣatriyas. Even in the family of Ikṣvāku,

one of the ancestors of Rāma opposed to forests and advocated wholesale deforestation, by which he got the name Anaraṇya.⁹¹ He incurred displeasure of the people so much that none of the successors of Anaraṇya attempted in further deforestation. By this reason Daśaratha won the pleasure of the śramaṇas. At the same time he also got the curse inadvertently from a śramaṇa. So also Viśvāmitra Kauśika represents yajñaic and śrāmaṇic, or kṣatriya and brāhmaṇa modes of life. He is a distant descendant of the Vedic seer Viśvāmitra and grandson of Kuśika.⁹² Even though the story of Viśvāmitra Kauśika was considered to be an interpolation, it prefigures this *darbha-kuśa* conflict. The very name Kuśika, derived from *kuśa*, refers to him to be a kṣatriya even though their ancestor Viśvāmitra was a great seer and composer of several hymns in the third maṇḍala of the *R̥gveda*, besides the famous *Gāyatrī-mantra*. Viśvāmitra Kauśika could succeed in bringing brāhmaṇa-kṣatriya synthesis and made true the derivation of his name, namely 'an universal friend'. In recognition of this Vālmīki described him as a brāhmaṇa and a kṣatriya.⁹³

That *darbha* grass, in contrast to *kuśa*, refers to śrāmaṇism and non-possessiveness is confirmed by two conclusive evidences.⁹⁴ Firstly there was a poet by name Rathavīti Dārbhya⁹⁵ (also Dālbhya by rhotacism⁹⁶), a descendant of Śyāvāśya Ātreya who composed verses 17-19 in RV. 5.61. Secondly Patañjali describes Pāṇini as *darbhāpavitrapāṇi* 'having hand auspicious with *darbha* grass' to show his non-possessiveness and selflessness in writing the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.⁹⁷

In contrast Paraśurāma Bhārgava, a śramaṇa being a brāhmaṇa resorted to kṣatriya rituals. Unlike Vasiṣṭhas, the Bhārgavas were aggressive using weapons and hence they had an axe and a bow of Viṣṇu. With the axe of wood cutter⁹⁸ and the bow of Viṣṇu Paraśurāma stretched his hand to kill the kṣatriyas, until the reconciliator Rāma overpowered and sent back the bow to Varuṇa, the Lord of *ṛtam* 'order'.

Rāma and Bharata set a new example. Kaikeyī wanted that Bharata should be a kṣatriya practising yajñaism and Rāma should become a śramaṇa like Ṛṣyaśṛṅga, and practise śrāmaṇism in the forest. But Bharata lived in the village Nandigrāma and practised

śrāmaṇism while Rāma with the śrāmaṇic garbs practised kṣatriya duties and annihilated all the sacrifice destroying demons and provided protection to the śrāmaṇic seers. Further while living in the palace he practised śrāmaṇism after sending his wife to the forest. Therefore one of his sons is called Lava representing śrāmaṇism and the other Kuśa representing yajñāism.

The birth asterism Punarvasū 'reprosperity' of Rāma go far in stretching our imagination. Punarvasū is considered as an auspicious asterism for establishing the sacred fires.⁹⁹ The *Taittirīya-brāhmaṇa* (1.1.2.2-3) says that he who establishes fires in the asterism Punarvasū gets wealth and becomes prosperous. Basing on the etymological sense 're-prosperity', the *Maitrāyaṇīya-samhitā* (1.7.2) says that he who re-establishes (*punarādhāna*) fire under Punarvasū becomes *prajāpati* 'creator' and becomes prosperous again, or regains wealth.¹⁰⁰

The elaborate discussion in the foregoing pages reveals that the historicity of the *Vālmīki-Rāmāyaṇa* cannot be denied and that this belongs to the same period during which the *Vājasaneyi-samhitā* of the *Śuklayajurveda* and its ancillaries developed.¹⁰¹ Further the text vouches the reformation of the policy of agriculture as a state issue and the need for shifting to farm culture from forest culture, thus revolutionizing the concept of nature worship.

Incidentally the discussion also affords the following conclusions in the state of affairs in the contemporary society:

1. The whole stretch of land, excluding the sea, from Ayodhyā to Lankā is interspersed with forests and cities. People domiciled in cities, villages, etc., are citizens with rights, duties and taxes. Those who live in forests do not pay taxes, but are governed by the rules of the government and protected by the sovereignty with which the forest rests. Hence these places are called *janasthāna*¹⁰² in opposition to *janapada*¹⁰³ which are laid with human effort and planned and wherein taxes are to be paid by the residents. Penalty for ignorance of law is upto the loss of life as in the case of Vālin.

2. A flexibility in residence was available. An individual or a group of people can be a permanent resident in a city or in a

forest and can also be an inhabitant for temporary residence as a visitor in either of the places at free will. Thus emigration and immigration are of personal choice.

3. Kaikeyī wanted Rāma to emigrate Ayoḍhyā to immigrate into a forest as an inhabitant with a hope that he would turn to a permanent forest resident in course of time by habit. Rāma was already a visitor to the forest dwellings before marriage and introduced to the śrāmaṇic way of life by Viśvāmitra. So legally Kaikeyī's contention could not be dismissed.

4. Rāma and Bharata showed new modes of life by setting themselves as examples. Thus one can be a recluse by practice in a city or a warrior in a forest.

5. People in the cities were having cooked food from the produce obtained by cultivation (*kr̥ṣṭapacya*) like rice, barley, meat, etc. The forest dwellers were nature friendly and preferred to live on the food whatever was available in the nature (*akr̥ṣṭapacya*).

6. Sacrifice was the main religious practice and they were performed in the forests and in the cities or in their outskirts.

REFERENCES

1. *Vālmīki-Rāmāyaṇa* [= Rām], 1.2.3ff., cr. ed. Oriental Institute, M.S. University, Baroda, 1960-.
2. *ibid.* 2.57.1-2.58.57.
3. *ṛṣyaśṛṅgo vanacaras tapassvādhyāyasamyutaḥ*, *ibid.* 1.93; *vane nityavāsīnām*, 1.9.21: *kanyām datvā ... śāntām*, 1.9.31-32; see also 1.10.3. The *Viṣṇu-purāṇa*, 4.18.16-18 informs that Daśaratha gave away his daughter Śāntā in adoption to Romapāda for the latter was childless.
4. *ibid.* 1.11.15.
5. *ibid.* 1.12.1, 34.
6. *ibid.* 1.28.5.
7. *ibid.* 1.46.11-12.
8. *ibid.* 1.18.4-8.
9. *ibid.* 1.20.11; 1.21.10-18; 1.26.2ff.
10. *ibid.* 1.29.6.

11. *ibid.* 1.30.6-7.
12. *ibid.* 1.46.11-22.
13. *ibid.* 1.47.11.
14. *ibid.* 1.47.14ff.
15. *imam āśramam utsrjya siddhacāraṇasevite/
himavacchikhare ramye tapas tepe mahātapāḥ*// *ibid.* 1.47.32.
16. *cf. vāyubhakṣā nirāhārā tapyanti bhasmaśāyini/
adṛśyā sarvabhūtānām āśrame 'smin nivatsyati*// *ibid.* 1.47.29.
17. That *janaka* was patronymic name and *sīradhvaja* was his personal name was evidenced by the *Viṣṇu-purāṇa*, 4.5.27 and 4.5.29: *sīradhvajasya bhrātā sāṅkāśyādhipatiḥ kuśadvajānāmāsīt*. Bhavabhūti corroborates this in his *Uttararāmacarita*: *bhagavaty arundhati vaidehaḥ sīradhvajo 'bhivādayate*, IV.9.
18. *atha me kṛṣataḥ kṣetram lāṅgalād utthitā mama/
kṣetram śodhayatā labdhā nāmnā sīteti viśrutā*// *bhūtalād utthitā sā tu vyavardhata mamātmajā/
vīryaśulketi me kanyā sthāpīteyam ayonijā*// *ibid.* 1.65.14-15. How *Sītā* is an *ayonijā*, see my article: 'Ayonija in Epics and Purāṇas', *S.V.U. Oriental Journal*, 32-34, pp. 57-73.
19. *ibid.* 1.65.9ff.
20. *ibid.* 1.66.8; 16-17.
21. *ibid.* 1.69.2-3; see also fn. 17 above.
22. *ibid.* 1.67.1.
23. *ibid.* 1.72.17. There are several verses found in different versions representing local customs and traditions. But this verse is certainly of *Vālmīki* because of the recurrence of a similar construction in *Rām.* 1.67.8-10:
*seyam mama sūtā rājan viśvāmitrapurāḥsaraḥ/
asmai deya mayā sītā vīryaśulkā mahātmāne*//
24. *janakasya vacaḥ śrutvā pāṇin pāṇibhir asprśan/
catvāras te catasṛṇām vasiṣṭhasya mate sthitāḥ*// *ibid.* 1.72.22.
25. *ibid.* 1.72.23.
26. *ibid.* 1.73.3-7.
27. *ibid.* 1.73.2.
28. *ibid.* 1.74; 1.76.1.
29. *devatāyatanāny āśu sarvās tāḥ pratyapūjayan/
abhivādyābhivadyāms ca sarvā rājasutās tadā/
remire muditāḥ sarvā bhartṛbhiḥ sahitā rahaḥ*// *ibid.* 1.76.9.
rāmas tu sītayā sārddham vijahāra bahūn ṛtūn// *ibid.* 1.76.14.

30. *ibid.* 2.4.2.
31. *ibid.* 2.10.27-28.
32. *ibid.* 3.1.14-21.
33. *ibid.* 3.9.3-8.
34. He visited the hermitages of Śarabhaṅga, Śutīkṣṇa, Māṇḍa-
karṇi, Agastya, etc.
35. *ayaṃ pañcavaṭīdeśaḥ saumya puṣpitakānanaḥ/ ibid.* 3.14.2.
*ayaṃ deśaḥ samaḥ śrīmān puṣpitaḥ tarubhir vṛtaḥ/
ihāśramapadaṃ saumya yathāvat kartum arhasi// ibid.*10.
36. *ibid.* 3.18.20-21; 3.32.5-11; 3.52.19-26.
37. *ibid.* 3.17.22.
38. *sā susilā vapuḥślāghyā rūpeṇāpratimā bhuvi/
tavānurūpā bhāryā sā tvaṃ ca tasyās tathā patiḥ// ibid.*3.32.17.
39. *ibid.* 3.33.11-14;cf.
*jitakāmaḥ ca siddhāḥ ca cāraṇaiś copaśobhitam/
ājair vaikhānasair māṣair vālakhilyair marīcipaiḥ//ibid.*3.33.15.
40. *ibid.* 3.33.16ff.
41. *ibid.* 3.50.2.
42. *śṛṇu maithilī madvākyaṃ māsān dvādaśa bhāmini/
kālenānena nābhyeṣi yadi mām cāruhāsini/
tatas tvām prātarāśārthaṃ sūdās chetsyanti leśaśaḥ//
ibid.* 3.54.21-22.
43. *ibid.* 3.70.4ff.
44. *ibid.* 4.12.1ff.
45. *prahasanti tu vaiidehī rāmaṃ vākyaṃ athābravīt/
tapovanāni puṇyāni draṣṭum icchāmi rāghava//
gaṅgātīre nivīṣṭhāni ṛṣīṇāṃ puṇyakarmaṇām/
phalamūlāśīnāṃ vīra pādāmūleṣu vartitum// ibid.* 7.41.23-24.
46. *ibid.* 7.45.7; 7.46.16-17.
47. *ibid.* 7.58.1.
48. *ibid.* 7.84.1.
49. *ibid.* 7.84.3-5. Vālmīki gave them fruits which were grown on
the hilly tracts and asked them to recite the Rāmāyaṇa eating
them time and again so that they would not get tired nor their
voice choked:
*imāni ca phalāṇy atra svādūni vividhāni ca/
jātāni parvatāgreṣu āsvādyāsvādya gīyatām//*

na yāsyathaḥ śramaṇi vatsau bhakṣayitvā phalāni vai/
mūlāni ca sumṛṣṭāni na rāgāt parihāsyathaḥ// ibid. 7.84.6-7.

50. ibid. 7.88.13.

51. M. Srimannarayana Murti, *Kaiṅkaryaratnāvali*, S.V.U. Oriental Journal, vol. 29, 1986 (pub. in 1993), Intr. pp. 5ff., 29ff. See also: G.C. Pande, *Śramaṇa Tradition - Its History and Contribution to Indian Culture*, L.D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad, 1978, p. 23ff.

52. That honey (*madhu*) was a drink is confirmed by its Indo-European cognates: Gk. *methu*, O.H.G. *metu*, Eng. *mead*, PIE. **medhu*. It is so familiar that it has been used as an adjective for ghee in RV. 4.57.2; VS. 12.70. Honey mixed with water is *madhumati* (RV.4.57.3). cf. *phalamūlāsanaḥ*, Rām. 3.1.6; *mūlaṃ puṣpaṃ phalaṃ vanyaṃ āśramam*, ibid. 3.1.16; *pañca pañcanakhā bhakṣyā brahmakṣatreṇa rāghava / śalyakaḥ śvāvidho godhā śāśaḥ kūrmaś ca pañcamah*//
ibid. 4.17.34.

53. Hence we have fire-rituals, water-rituals, breath-rituals, water-fire rituals in the Vedic tradition. See fn. 51 above.

54. cf. *varuṇaḥ kṣatram iyaṃ bhagena savitā śriyam / sutrāmā yaśasālī balaṃ dadhānā yajñam āśatom*//
Taittirīya-brāhmaṇa, 2.6.13.3.

A separate branch of learning called *kṣatra-vidyā* comprehending warfare and statecraft came to be recognised in contrast to the Veda to be studied by the brahmins as well in the *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 7.1.2.

55. For example the hermitages of Gautama (Rām. 1.47.9-11), Viśvāmitra (Rām. 1.22) and Vālmīki (Rām. 1.2.3) were neither in the cities and also nor far from them.

56. Appayadīkṣita has rightly analysed the word *brāhmaṇa*: *brahma aṇati avagacchatīti brāhmaṇaḥ*, *Parimala-ṭīkā* on the *Kalpataru* on *Bhāmatī*, 3.4.47.

57. M. Srimannarayana Murti, 'Brahmins and Kshatriyas in the Vedic Age' *S.V.U. Oriental Journal*, vol. 38.

58. The plough share is prayed that it should break up the land happily, by which the ploughman goes happily with the oxen: *śunaṃ naḥ phalā vi kṣantu / bhūmiṃ śunaṃ kīnāsām abhi yantu vāhaiḥ*// RV. 4.57.8.

59. Sītā is addressed as:

arvācī śubhage bhava sīte vandāmahe tvā/

yathā naḥ subhagāsasi yathā naḥ suphalāsasi// RV. 4.57.6.

Here it may be noted that the word *sītā* is of unknown origin; for $\sqrt{sī}$ which is ascribed by the grammarians in the sense of 'to draw a stright line' is not found used as a finite verb in the Vedic literature.

60. M. Srimannarayana Murti, 'The Thunder and the Lightning', *Adyar Library Bulletin*, vol.53 (1989), p. 73.

61. *indraḥ sītām ni grhṇātu*, RV.4.57.7. The *Āśvalāyana-gr̥hya-sūtra*, 2.10 prescribes that with the recitation of these hymns, an oblation is to be made. It can also be done with out oblations, by merely muttering these hymns.

62. *Vājasaneyī-saṃhitā* [VS], 12.67-71.

63. Cf. *rājasūya-sūrya-mṛṣodya-rucya-kupya-kṛṣṭapacyāvyathyāḥ*, Pāṇ. 3.1.114; VS. 18.14.

64. Thus the Śrauta literature prescribes burning of the sarificial pendal on the completion of the sacrifice and departure of the people to different directions.

65. *ṣaḍ dvādaśa caturviṃśatiṃ vā yunakti*, *Kātyāyana-śrauta-sūtra* [KSS], 17.2.10. Here it may be noted that the *Satyāśāḍha* and *Bhāradvāja śrauta-sūtras* prescribe that the place fixed for the erection of the mound (*citi*) should be ploughed six furrows with a plough yoked with six, or twelve or twentyfour oxen; cf. *dakṣiṇataḥ śākhām udasi tv āpa upaspr̥śyoddhṛtyāvokṣya savitaitāni śarīrāṇi iti sīram yunakti ṣaḍgavam dvādaśagavam caturviṃśatigavam vā*, *Bhāradvāja-śrauta-sūtra*, *Bhāradvāja-pāitrmedhika-sūtra*, 2.4.2.

66. *mā vo riṣat khanitāyasmai cāhaṃ khanāmi vaḥ/ dvīpāc catuṣpād asmākaṃ sarvaṃ astv anāturam// VS. 12.95.*

67. *kuśastambam upadadhāti madhye tūṣṇīm. pañcagṛhītenodgrhṇann abhijuhoti sajūr abda* (VS.12.74) *iti*, KSS. 17.3.1-2.

68. Cf. *ninayaty udacamasān* (ŚB. 7.2.4.6) *sarvaṃ evāgnikṣetraṃ kṛṣṭaṃ cākṛṣṭaṃ ca*, KSS.17.3.5.

69. *agnis ca ma āpaś ca me vīrudhaś ca ma oṣadhayaś ca me kṛṣṭapacyāś ca me 'kṛṣṭapacyāś ca me grāmyāś ca me paśava āraṇyāś ca me vittam ca me vittis ca me bhūtam ca me bhūtis ca me yajñena kalpantām*, VS. 18.14.

70. *vrihiyavānām yatra yatra yajeta tanmayam sthālīpākam śrapayet, Pāraskara-gṛhya-sūtra* [PGS], 2.17.2.
71. English tr. of H. Oldenberg in the *Gṛhya-sūtras*, SBE 29 for the hymn:
*yasyā bhāve vaidikalaukikānām bhūtir bhavati karmaṇām/
 indrapatnīm upahvaye sītām me sā tv anapāyini bhūyāt
 karmaṇi svāhā//* ibid. 2.17.9.
72. *grāme vobhayasaṃprayogād avirodhāt*, ibid. 2.17.7.
73. *kāmādijāno 'nyatrāpi vrihiyavayor evānyataram sthālīpākam śrapayet*, ibid. 2.17.3.
74. *vedyāḥ sītāyā hradād goṣṭhāc catuṣpathād ādevanād ādahanād īriṇāt sarvebhyaḥ saṃbhāryam navamam, Gobhila-gṛhyasūtra* [GGS], 2.1.4.
75. *pūrveṣām caturṇām gṛhṇantīm upayacchet*, ibid. 2.1.7.
76. *vedipiṇḍāt kriyāvati sītāyāḥ phalate kṛṣiḥ /
 akṣobhya ca hrade jñeyā goṣṭe bhavati gomati//
 catuṣpathe prakīrṇā syād dyūstasthāne kalipriyā/
 śmaśāne mriyate bhartā vandhyā bhavati coṣare/
 navame sarva evaite kanyāyāḥ pariḡrhyante//*
Gṛhyasaṃgraha, 2.21-23.
77. *saṃbhāryam api tv eke*, GGS. 2.1.8.
78. For further details see my article: 'Ayonija in Epics and Purāṇas', *S.V.U. Oriental Journal*, vol. 32-34, pp. 62ff.
79. *nadisasyakṣetrataṭākadarbhamūlagajadantoddhṛtagoviṣāṇod-
 dhṛtakulīrvāsavalīmīkeṣu aṣṭau mṛdo yathālābham vā gṛhṇīyāt*,
Vimānārcanākalpa, Paṭala 47, p. 323, Madras, 1926.
80. ...*sarvatra vitānadhvajadarbhamālātaraṅgastambaveṣṭanā-
 dyaiḥ ... alaṃkṛtya...*, ibid. p. 326.
81. *dhānyavediṃ gāyatrīyā prokṣya 'sumitrāna' iti paṅktisthalaṃ
 ullikhya, 'hiraṇyapaṇim' iti prāgagrān uttarāgrān vā darbhaṃ
 āstīrya ..*, ibid. p. 327.
- The Gorakhpur and Parimal editions of the *Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa* read:
*alaṃcakāra tāṃ vedim gandhapuṣpaiḥ samantataḥ/
 suvarṇapālikābhiś ca citrakumbhaiś ca sāṅkuraiḥ//
 aṅkurādhyaiḥ śarāvaiś ca dhūpapātraiḥ sadhūpakaiḥ/
 śaṅkhapātraiḥ sruvaiḥ srugbhiḥ pātrair arghyādipūjitaiḥ//*

*lājapūrṇaiś ca pātrībhīr akṣatair api saṃskṛtaiḥ/
darbhaiḥ samaiḥ samāstīrya vidhivan mantrapūrvakam//*

1.73.21-23.

These verses are treated as interpolations in the critical edition of Baroda.

82. *paścimadvārottare 'yatas tvam āsīd' iti kuśodakam saṃnyasya, tasmin munīn, upasnāne takṣakam abhyarcya 'catvāri vāg' iti kuśodakena snāpayet, Vimānārcanākālpa 49, p. 332. See also ibid. 54, p. 357. There are twelve types of waters with which the deities are given ceremonious ablutions; cf.... pañcagavya-ghṛtamadhudadhikṣīragandhodakākṣatodakaphalodakakuśodakaratanodakajapyodakasarsapodakasarvauśadhyudakāni dvādaśa pradhānāni..., ibid. 48, p. 324.*
83. *darbhān kuśān samidho vā māsātītān saṃgrhya tattatkarma kṛtvā taddoṣaśamanārthaṃ vāruṇaṃ, vaiṣṇavaṃ, brāhmaṃ, saumyaṃ, āgneyaṃ, ādityaṃ ca juhuyāt, ibid. 65, p. 406.*
84. M. Srimannarayana Murti, *Kaiṅkaryaratnāvali*, p. 31.
85. For exclusion there should be a close similarity between the object negated and the object signified by the compound. See M. Srimannarayana Murti, *Sanskrit Compounds - A Philosophical Study*, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies 93, 1974, pp. 243ff.
86. Patañjali gives *halyā* and *paramahalyā* in MB. 1.1.72.
87. Pāṇini 4.4.91 and 97 and the *Bhāṣya* and the *Kāśikā* thereon. See also: *rathasītāhalebhyo yadvidhau, Vārttika 16* under the rule 1.1.72. So *dvisītya* and *dviḥhalya* mean 'twice ploughed (field)'. When *karṣa* in Pāṇ. 4.4.97 is taken in the sense of *bhāva* 'action', *halya* also means 'a plough line or furrow'. Haradatta connects *sītā* and *hala* as instruments of agriculture, and derives *sītā* from the root *ī* with the preposition *saṃ* and noun-formative suffix *-aṇ* in the denotative sense of 'plough share' (*halāgram*) (i.e. a synonym of *sīra*). So *dvisītyam* according to Haradatta is 'a field ploughed with two shares' (*Padamañjarī* on *Kāśikā* 4.4.91).
88. *gr̥hītasamidhaṃ tatra sakuśaṃ munipuṅgavam, Rām. 1.47.23.*
89. PGS. 2.17.9; cf. fn. 71 above.
90. cf. *indrasyaiva caturbhāgaḥ prajā rakṣati rāghava, Rām. 3.1.18.*
91. *ibid. 1.69.21; Viṣṇupurāṇa, 4.3.17.*
92. Vālmīki calls Viśvāmitra as *kuśikātmaja* (1.50.8; 1.64.1, 26) in the sense of *gotrāpatya* (Pāṇ. 4.1.16 2: *apatyam pautraprabhṛti*

gotram). Kuśika or Kuśa (Rām.1.50.18) is the great-grandfather, and Kuśanābha and Gādhi are the grand-father and father respectively of Viśvāmitra.

93. Rām. 1.64.22-26.
94. RV. 5.61.17-19.
95. M. Srimannarayana Murti, *An Introduction to Sanskrit Linguistics*. p. 183, 72, 17. D.K. Publications, Delhi 1984.
96. *Mahābhāṣya*. 1.1.1, p. 39, BORI edn.
97. According to Pāṇini's rule 4.2.111: *kaṇvādibhyo gotre, dārbhya* is derived from the noun *darbha* by adding the patronymic affix (*gotrāpatya-pratyaya*) -aṇ. Thus *darbha* is a personal name of an individual like *kuśa* to which a patronymic affix could be added.
98. *Nighaṇṭu*, 2.20.
99. *Taittirīya-brāhmaṇa*, 1.1.2, 2-3, *Baudhāyana-śrauta-sūtra*, 2.12, *Satyāśādhā-śrauta-sūtra*, 32.
See also: Maitreyi Rangnekar, 'The Time of Establishment of Fires (Agnyādhāna)' *S.V.U. Oriental Journal*, vol. 30-31, p. 125.
100. TS. 1.5.1, KS. 8.15, ŚB. 2.1.2.101, KatyŚS. 4.11.5, BharŚS. 5.1.10, ApŚS. 5.3.7. SatyŚS. 3.2, ManŚS. 1.5.1.7 also prescribe re-establishment of Fires.
101. All the western scholars opine, on the basis of linguistic and historical features, that the *Rāmāyaṇa* was far away from the *Veda* and the *Rāma* legend was connected with the Vedic literature only through very thin threads (M. Winternitz, *A History of Indian Literature*, vol. 1, Eng. tr. V. Srinivasa Sarma, p. 493f., Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1987). Albrecht Weber pointed out connections between the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Yajurveda* ('Über des *Rāmāyaṇa*', *Abhandlungen der Berliner Akademie aus dem Jahre 1870*, p. 8), but they are considered weak to establish their contemporariness. In this paper an attempt was made to show that the *Yajurveda* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* belong to the same core of culture and thus to the same epoch through the phenomenological approach.
102. Rām. 1.23.16; 23; 4.41.5.
103. *ibid.* 2.108.11.

V.C. NARAYANA DAS

THE INTEGRAL HUMANISM OF SRĪ NARAYANA GURU

The philosophy of Advaita is regarded as the quintessence of Indian thought. Although this system found its complete and final form in the hands of Śaṅkarācārya, for centuries it remained confined to a few privileged philosophers and saints. Even in that case, very often the whole emphasis was on its theoretical and transcendental aspects. The practical implications of the truth of Advaita for human life in this world were often ignored. By and large, scholars of Advaita appeared to be concerned exclusively with all kinds of intellectual analysis and justification of its doctrines rather than with the practical appropriation of its insights. Surely, Advaita philosophy is far more than a mere theory formulated for the sake of satisfying man's intellectual curiosity. It claims itself as the ultimate truth about man and his world. As such, it not only reveals the transcendence of man's essential self and its ultimate identity with the absolute reality (Brahman), but also contains within itself all the necessary truths about man's existence here and now. It is the way of life in which man finds the fulfilment of all his genuine aspirations. To look upon Advaita only as a way to final deliverance, or simply as an ideal relating to the hereafter, is to miss its true value and significance. In fact, it contains a philosophy of human existence as a whole, and as such, every aspect of human life must find its respective place within it. However, stress has

often been laid on Advaita only as an answer to man's spiritual quest. Consequently, it was viewed as a doctrine which had little or nothing to do with the life and problems of man on earth. This has resulted not only in reducing Advaita to an individual-centred philosophy but also to an ideology without any concern for the material, social and economic aspects of life.

The history of modern Indian thought has proved that the practical implications of Advaita philosophy could not remain hidden for ever. 'One of the most significant aspects of Vedantic thought in the modern age has been a clear recognition of the need for a comprehensive outlook on man and his problems. Thus, we can find a number of thinkers during the past two centuries who have tried to provide us with a philosophy of man, a philosophy in which all aspects of man's being are taken into account. They admit the fact that man shall not live by bread alone. But at the same time, they have been able to realize also that he cannot be reduced to a disembodied spirit. They say him as an extremely complex and dynamic being with all the material, biological, psychological, social, economic, political, ethical, religious and spiritual dimensions of his reality. P.T. Raju points towards this fact when he says, "But what is man? Is he the spirit (*ātman*), the soul (*jīva*), mind, life or physical body? I think that in the opinion of the Upaniṣads, he is all these put together in an integral form."¹ There is no doubt that an over-emphasis on some aspect of his being, or a disregard for some of them, quite naturally results in a distorted picture of man. Perhaps, many of the advocates of Advaita in the past were so pre-occupied with their concern for the spiritual liberation of man that there was considerable indifference towards the problems of life in this world. To a large extent, the modern thinkers and social reformers have been able to overcome this handicap. They could recognize that the need of the hour was a humanistic approach to the problems of man on the basis of the message or Vedānta. They saw the practical implications of the philosophy of Advaita as providing lasting solutions to the miseries of mankind as a whole. Thus a number of humanistic philosophies which are rooted and grounded in the religious traditions of India have been expounded by such modern thinkers as Raja Rammohan Roy, Swami Vivekananda, Rabindranath Tagore, Śrī Aurobindo and Mahātmā Gandhi. Śrī Nārāyaṇa Guru was one of the greatest saints who represented this

trend in Kerala. The Guru in his own unique way, tried to give expression to a genuine form of 'Religious Humanism' based upon the philosophy of Advaita. Of course he is not so well known outside of Kerala like Swami Vivekananda or Śrī Aurobindo. Nevertheless, he is quite significant for us today by the fact he has been able to revolutionize the belief, practices and life-styles of millions of people, on the basis of the truth of Advaita as he understood it.

I

Śrī Nārāyaṇa Guru was born on 20th August 1854, at Chempazhanti, which is situated about 12 kilometers to the north of Trivandrum. His father, Madan Asan was a farmer and village school teacher. His mother, Kochupennu was a very pious and kind-hearted woman. He belonged to the community of Ezhavas who were treated as untouchables by the Brahmins and Nairs during those days. As a young child he was brought up in a religious atmosphere, since the elder members of his family were regular worshippers at a nearby shrine (Manakkal Bhagavati Temple). An intensely religious bent of mind was evident in him from his very childhood. He revolted against the practice of untouchability even when he was a young boy. He was initiated into learning by one Chempazhanti Pillai. He got his early education from his father and his uncle who was a reputed Ayurvedic physician. Recognizing his thirst for knowledge and intellectual abilities he was sent to Kayamkulam in central Travancore for further studies in Sanskrit under one Raman Pillai Asan, a distinguished scholar of those days. It gave him the opportunity to learn the languages and literature of both Tamil and Sanskrit. He could spend only three years there, as he was forced to discontinue his formal studies due to severe illness. However, he continued his studies at home without the help of a teacher and gained sufficient mastery over many fields of knowledge.

Nārāyaṇa had developed the habit of meditation from a very young age. He was very fond of undertaking lonely walks. Occasionally he delivered religious discourses at temples. This practice had earned him the title, 'Asan' (= in older times a village school teacher in Kerala was known as *asan*). By that time the elders could discover in him the symptoms of deep-rooted ascetic and spiritual tendencies. In order to bring about a change of mind,

they got him married. Though he did not object to the wishes of the elders, he could not lead the life of a householder. His intense desire for knowledge and spiritual self-realization compelled him to leave his home in search of truth. He wandered from place to place visiting temples and meeting scholars and saints wherever he found them. It was during these wanderings that he met Kunjan Pillai, better known as Chattampi Swamikal. The latter took him to one Thykkattu Ayyavu under whom Nārāyaṇa took training in Yogic practices. But the learning of Yoga did not satisfy him, as his goal was nothing short of the realization of truth. So he continued his wanderings and meditations in jungles and deep forests.

He travelled all over South India and tried to acquire spiritual insights from saints and scholars. This enabled him to enrich his knowledge of Vedānta as well as Śaivasiddhānta. Thereafter he withdrew himself to total seclusion in a forest. He spent considerable period of time in constant prayer and meditation in a cave at Pillathadom on the top of a hill called Marutwamalai (it is situated in the present Kanyakumari district of Tamil Nadu). He came out of the cave only after the attainment of his goal of self realization. This event took place in 1887 and thereafter he was known as Śrī Nārāyaṇa Guru. As a *jīvanmukta* he devoted the rest of his life on earth for the emancipation of his fellow beings. The Guru passed away on 20th September 1928 at Varkala.

II

Śrī Nārāyaṇa Guru wrote a number of works in Sanskrit, Malayalam and Tamil languages. He was equally proficient in all these three languages. His works include prose as well as poems. In fact, he was a poet of extraordinary talent. His major philosophical works on Advaita philosophy are *Ātmopadeśa-śatakam* (Centiloquy to Self) in Malayalam, and *Darśanamālā* (Garland of Visions) in Sanskrit. There are also other shorter compositions like *Advaita-dīpikā* (Bright Lamp of Non-dual Wisdom), *Anukampa-daśakam* (Ten Verses on Mercy), *Arivu* (Knowledge) and *Cijjaḍa-cintanam* (Reflections on Mind and Matter) which are intended to provide further clarifications on the subject. He wrote a number of hymns on Śiva, Subrahmaṇya, and Mother Goddess. His important works on social and ethical philosophy are *Jāti-mīmāṃsā* (A Critique of Caste), *Jīvakāruṇya-pañcakam* (Five Verses on Kindness to Life)

and *Municaryā-pañcakam* (Five Verses on the Way of Renounced Recluse). He has also translated the *Īśāvāsyopaniṣad* from Sanskrit and *Ozhivil Oḍukkam* and a part of *Tirukkural* from Tamil. His *Kundalinipattu* (Song of Kuṇḍalinī) is another composition in Malayalam and it is very famous for its charming melody and conceptual clarity.

Śrī Nārāyaṇa Guru accepted the philosophy of Vedānta as it was interpreted by Śaṅkarācārya himself. "Śaṅkara's point of view is our own", he said to his disciple, Dr. Nataraja Guru.² However, according to Nataraja Guru, the statement quoted above should be taken along with Guru's further remark: "If there was anything that he, the Guru Nārāyaṇa, came to teach, it was that there was no room for justification for caste distinctions like Brahmin and Pariah."³

Obviously Śrī Nārāyaṇa Guru had no new religion or philosophy to teach. He had realized the truth of Advaita. What he really wanted was the practical application of the philosophy of Advaita to the lives of the individuals as well as to the society. His philosophical treatises are not intended to provide us with any new or different insight into reality. They are nothing but simplified expressions of the Advaita philosophy in Nārāyaṇa Guru's own unique style.

III

In order to understand and appreciate the real significance of the mission work of Śrī Nārāyaṇa Guru, it is absolutely necessary for us to have an idea of the social conditions of Kerala during the nineteenth century when he began his work. The practice of untouchability was very wide-spread. It was rather unapproachability. The people of the lower castes were treated so inhumanly that they had to maintain a certain minimum distance from those belonging to the higher castes. Some Namboothiri Brahmins were so orthodox that they were afraid of pollution by the mere sight of a low-caste man. Even among the so-called low castes with their innumerable sub-castes, there were clear distinctions between the higher and the lower ones. They too observed untouchability and carefully followed the conventions regarding the distance they had to maintain from one another in order to avoid pollution.

Education and civilized way of life were totally forbidden to the low-castes. In all their conducts they were supposed to submit to the dictates of the high caste men or to face severe punishment including death. They were strictly prohibited from the vicinity of the temples which were controlled by high-castes. At the same time these down-trodden people were also steeped in all kinds of superstitious practices and strange social customs and conventions. They worshipped their own deities. Animal sacrifices and libation with liquor formed part of the rituals associated with their worship. The practice of black magic was also a wide-spread phenomenon.

It is from this background that the life and mission of Śrī Nārāyaṇa Guru is to be understood. There is no wonder that this philosopher-saint, unlike many other similar figures, began his work not by preaching certain doctrines, but by concrete actions for the redemption of the suffering humanity. The blessed experience of the Ultimate Reality as non-dual Brahman moved him to find out ways and means to share the bliss with his fellow beings. After his wonderful spiritual self-realization he came from the seclusion of the hills and forests to the valley and lived among the fishermen for some time. Then he moved to a locality called Aruvippuram which is about twentyfive kilometers to the south of Trivandrum, and spent a few days in a cave which he found suitable for undisturbed meditation. But when the people of the adjoining villages knew about the presence of a strange man in the cave, they came in large numbers to see him. To their great surprise they discovered him to be a holy man with miraculous powers. Gradually some of them began to look upon him as a God. Śrī Nārāyaṇa Guru was quick to detect the trend and realized the need for a temple for them to worship God. Thus at Aruvippuram on the auspicious night of Śivarātri in 1887 he placed a Śiva-liṅgam and consecrated it according to the tāntrik rites and formalities. Very soon a temple was built around that place. This event is known as aruvippuram pratiṣṭha. It was an unprecedented and startling event in which an untouchable śūdra dared to do something which was thus far conceived as the exclusive prerogative of brahmins. However, when he was questioned by certain brahmins about his authority to consecrate the Śivaliṅga, Śrī Nārāyaṇa Guru replied in his characteristic humour, "I have installed only an Ezhava Śiva."⁴

Very soon, Śrī Nārāyaṇa Guru came to be recognized as the unquestionable leader of a whole community belonging to the castes of Ezhava and Thiyya. It was at this period that Dr. Palpu, an Ezhava gentleman, who was desperately in search of an ideal religious man under whose leadership he wanted to organize and strengthen his community, happened to know about the Guru. Dr. Palpu was an eminent physician, who was denied a government job in the state of Travancore purely on account of his belonging to a lower caste. The meeting of the two men resulted in the formation of Śrī Nārāyaṇa Dharma Paripalana (SNDP) Yogam, which served as a mighty social and religious organization for the all-round development of the Ezhava and Thiyya communities.

The *aruvippuram pratiṣṭha* was a very important event. Not just because it marked the beginning of an era in which caste distinctions ceased to have any meaning at all, but because it was also the beginning of a historic mission assumed by a great saint. It was significant because it was the indication of the fact that an Advaita philosopher had recognized the real demand of the time to be a humanistic and pragmatic in approach to the pressing problems of his fellow-beings. In fact, the total literary production of Śrī Nārāyaṇa Guru may not exceed two hundred printed pages. But he could revolutionize the lives of about two million people through a life of dedicated service on the basis of the principles of Advaita as he understood them.

The message of Advaita as Śaṅkara interpreted it, and as Śrī Nārāyaṇa Guru realized it, consists in the affirmation of the essential divinity of man, the unity of mankind, and ultimately the unity of everything in the Absolute Reality which transcends all thought and experience. Hence the teachings of the Guru could be summarized in his oft-quoted statement: "One Caste, One Religion and One God for humanity." If the individual self is ultimately identical with the Brahman, then it is essentially divine. Every man, therefore, is potentially Brahman. It follows that all men are equal in essence and so there is no ground for any kind of discrimination between man and man. In his *Jāti-mīmāṃsā* (Critique of Caste), the Guru makes the truth plain in the following verse:

Man's humanity marks out of the human kind
Even as bovinity proclaims a cow,

Brahminhood and such are not thus-wise;
None do see this truth alas;
One of kind, one of faith,
And one in God is man,
Of one womb, of one form;
Difference herein none.⁵

Further he confirms the truth of the above conclusion by citing clear examples from the religious tradition itself:

In by-gone days of a Pariah woman the great

sage Parāśara was born

As even he of Vedic-aphorism fame of a virgin of

the fisher-folk.⁶

Commenting on this verse of the *Jāti-mīmāṃsā* Dr. Nataraja Guru states: "Here essentially the plea is that man should realize his true humanity and unitive solidarity, and realize also that terms like *brahmin* and *pariah* are ideas superimposed on the reality that is human nature which is essentially one, and fundamentally of one single sameness."⁷ In other words, one may say that the divinity, equality, fraternity and unity of mankind are definite implications of the message of Advaita.

“What is the use of merely reading the Vedānta?” asked Vivekananda in one of his conversations. “We must prove the truth of pure Advaitism in practical life”, the Swamy says, “Śaṅkara left this Advaita philosophy in hills and forests, while I have come to bring it out of these places, scatter it, broadcast before the work a day world and society.”⁸ It was exactly the same thing that Śrī Nārāyaṇa Guru did. He travelled from place to place exhorting every one to recognize one’s own true humanity. The practical teachings of the Guru enabled lakhs of people to get rid of their useless superstitions and unnecessary rituals and practices, and to come forward to worship God in spirit and truth. Following the *aruvippuram pratiṣṭha* he established a number of temples in various parts of Kerala. Further, in order to perform the necessary rituals in these temples, a number of young men (*brahmacārins*) were recruited and they were given training in philosophy, *mantras* and *tantras*. Thus, he made it possible for a vast number of down-trodden people, who were prohibited even from coming near to the

temples, to worship God in the traditional Hindu manner without fear.

The Guru did not explain away the phenomenal world as illusion. He did agree with Śaṅkara that it is *Māyā*. The world is a superimposition, but it must be remembered that it has its basis in the Reality itself. Thus we find him to be very fond of using the analogy of ocean and the waves in order to explain the relationship between the Brahman and the world. In the *Advaita-dīpikā* he tells us:

“That which is in the effect is nothing other than the cause.
The wave is nothing other than the water itself.”⁹

In this context, it is also significant that the Guru at times replaces the analogy of the rope and the snake with a fragrant garland and snake. For example, in the *Ātmopadeśa-śatakam* he says:

“The world has no separate reality,
For people to say so is mere conjecture,
Even if it appears to the dull-headed as a reptile
Can a fragrant garland become a snake?”¹⁰

A positive attitude to the material world has been a characteristic feature in the Advaita Philosophy of Śrī Nārāyaṇa Guru. Hence he made every effort to improve the conditions of human life in this world. He found that the most important factor behind a thorough social reformation and upliftment of the poor masses is education. He, therefore, founded a number of educational institutions including schools for vocational training. He inspired his followers to engage themselves in all forms of trade, industries and agriculture, in order to make themselves economically self-sufficient and to lead a happy life.

Love and compassion for all living beings and the cultivation of an attitude of universal brotherhood have been the key notes of Śrī Nārāyaṇa Guru's teachings. Two of his compositions are exclusively devoted to the praise of the qualities of sympathy and compassion.¹¹ Love and service to one another, according to him, are the natural attitudes of man in the light of the truth of Advaita. This is evident from a stanza in the *Ātmopadeśa-śatakam*,

where he says that when one reflects upon what is known as this man and that man, one would be led to the conclusion that the basis of such distinctions is one single Primordial Self and so, what one does for one's own happiness must result in the happiness of others also. Hence, he says further, that all those actions which would bring good to oneself and unhappiness to the others are self-contradictory.

IV

Śrī Nārāyaṇa Guru appeared on the scene of Kerala at a crucial period of its history. For self-realization he renounced the world. But once the goal is attained, the Guru assumed the humanistic mission of social and religious reformation. He was an Advaitin who had realized the ultimate Reality as the non-dual Brahman. And yet, he adopted a positive attitude to the world and ephemeral existence of man. It was such comprehensive outlook on both the spiritual and material aspects of human reality that enabled him to develop an integral humanism, which became a revolutionary force for the emancipation of millions of people.

REFERENCES

1. Radhakrishnan, S. & P.T. Raju, *Concept of Man* (London: Allan & Unwin, 1960), p. 304.
2. Nataraja Guru, *The World of the Guru* (Ernakulam: Paico 1968), p. 192.
3. *ibid.*
4. K. Srinivasan, *Sree Narayana Guru*, (Trivandrum: Jayasree, 1989), p.44.
5. Śrī Nārāyaṇa Guru, *Jātimīmāṃsā*, 1-2.
6. *ibid.* 5.
7. Nataraja Guru, *The World of the Guru*, p. 275.
8. Swami Vivekananda, *Collected Works*, vol. VII (Calcutta: Advaita Ashram, 1972), p. 162.
9. Śrī Nārāyaṇa Guru, *Advaita-dīpikā*, 2.
10. Śrī Nārāyaṇa Guru, *Ātmopadeśasatakam*, 20.
11. Śrī Nārāyaṇa Guru, *Anukampa-daśakam* and *Jīvakārūṇya-pāñcakam*.

K.K.A. VENKATACHARI

THE ŚRĪVAIṢṆAVA ĀGAMAS AND THE INDIGENOUS TRADITION OF SOUTH INDIA

In the Hindu tradition, we observe two different streams of thought and practice, viz. the Nigama and the Āgama or - the Vedic and non-Vedic - respectively. The former (the Vedic) has come as a later cultural imposition, whereas the latter (non-Vedic or indigenous) has come down from time immemorial by way of the teachings of the Lord, or His Consort as the case may be, to the devotees. So as to attain harmony between these two traditions, the Nigama and the Āgama had to be combined, and the Vedic gods had to be accommodated among the non-Aryan deities. Likewise, the elaborate Vedic *homa*-sacrifice had to be placed on an equal status with the flower ritual (*pūjā*) of the Āgama. The Nigama and Āgama traditions thus combined have had the resultant effect on the Hindu mind of unity in diversity. Through a sustained focus on the Śrīvaiṣṇava Āgama literature, I will in this essay, discern the striking presence of the indigenous tradition of South India in the very texts on which pan-Indian Hindu temple religion is founded.

Over the long history of the Hindu peoples, the worship of images in temples has become the *summum bonum* of their way of life. What is of crucial significance to the understanding of the historical development of the Hindu devotional tradition is the

relatively ignored fact that many of the rituals which form the very heart of Hindu temple religion are, indeed, based on Dravidian and/or other indigenous traditions.

The most important texts incorporating these indigenous temple practices are the Āgamas, which consist mainly of prescriptions regulating the specific routines of image worship. The texts discuss various inter-connected and cognate topics, such as: the selection of the site for the construction of the temple, the acceptable materials for construction, iconometry, details of architectural design, qualities that the sculptor must possess, the role of the ācārya, and so forth. The scope of the subjects dealt within the Āgamas can be comprehended by the phrase *karṣaṇādi-pratiṣṭhāntam*, which includes everything from the selection of the soil on which the temple is to be constructed to the final act of the consecration of the image. The selection of the soil is done not only for the construction of the temple, but also for the town in which the temple is to be located. The Āgamas thus visualize a scheme of town planning, in which the temple is the town's central focus.

I

Etymology of the word āgama: While undertaking any discussion of the Āgama texts it would be *prima facie* essential to convey the origin and meaning of the term āgama. Great attention has been paid to temple construction and icon making in all three Āgama traditions: Śaiva, Vaiṣṇava and Śākta. In all three, the architectural structure of the temple is compared to that of the human body and the image in the *garbhagrha* is likened to the *jīva* in the body.

Various etymologies of the word āgama are available; for instance, the word āgama may be derived from the verbal root *gam* with the prefix *ā* meaning "that which has come". Beyond this, *Piṅgalamata*, a *Nighaṇṭu* work, gives the meaning of āgama as "knowledge of Śiva, who has five faces". Further, according to Vācaspatimiśra's *Tattvaviśārādī*, āgama denotes knowledge entering the mind enabling one to attain salvation. The *Śābdakalpādruma* defines āgama as that which contains seven aspects of knowledge: *sṛṣṭi*, *pralaya*, *devatārcana*, *sādhana*, *punaścaraṇa*, *yoga* and *satkarma*.

Validity of the Āgamas: In Vedic literature, image worship is nowhere prescribed, whereas in the indigenous tradition the worshipping of images - including the offering of *pūjā* with incense - is very common. When this practice based on common tradition took strong root in society, however, it became extremely difficult to ignore it completely.

Generally, the followers of the Vedic tradition, who performed *yajñas* and other rituals prescribed in the *Vedas*, were hesitant to accept the authority of the Āgamas for worship. Thus, they went to the extreme of declaring the adherents of the Āgamas, that is, those who worship images and partake of the food offered to the deity as *Vrātyas* and outcastes. This in turn prompted people versed both in the *Vedas* and the Āgamas to resolve this dichotomy in practices. Efforts were made to prove the comparability of Āgamic practices with Vedic orthopraxy. This in itself shows that the traditional Āgamic rituals not found in the *Vedas* but practised in the temples are based on indigenous practices.

A descriptive overview of the Āgamas:

Generally, the Āgamas may be divided into three categories, namely, Śaiva, Vaiṣṇava, and Śākta, respectively connoting the supremacy of Śiva, Viṣṇu, and Śakti. Though all these Āgamas claim their origin from the Supreme God according to their own philosophical-theological position, it is difficult to accurately date the Āgama texts in their present form. The first chapter of every Āgama deals with its origin. Consequently, this introductory chapter is an important one, as we can often glean from it significant information about the Āgamic tradition itself. Almost all the Āgamas claim the origination of the tradition from either *Brahmā* or the Supreme Brahman and Lord.

The Śaiva Āgamas are classified as four-fold: *Kāpāla*, *Kālāmukha*, *Pāśupata* and Śaiva. The last one is again subdivided into Kashmir Śaiva and Siddhānta Śaiva. Kashmir Śaivism, as its name suggests, is followed mainly in North India, while Siddhānta Śaiva is in vogue primarily in South India. There are twentyeight basic Āgamas. Each of the twentyeight has one or more supplements called *Upāgama*, which brings the total to two hundred and seven.

Śākta Tantras (*Āgamas* and *Upāgamas*) are traditionally enumerated as sixtyfour, but the extant number is actually larger. The Śākta Āgamas are grouped into two kinds: *dakṣiṇa* and *vāma*, namely, the right-handed and the left-handed schools.

II

Vaiṣṇavāgamas: Among the Vaiṣṇava Āgamas there are likewise two schools: the Vaikhānasa and Pāñcarātra. Though both of these schools accept the supremacy of Lord Viṣṇu, there are certain essential differences in the doctrines which they teach.

Vaikhānasa Āgamas: The Vaikhānasa Āgamas are mainly concerned with worship of the Lord in a concrete form. To that end, detailed prescriptions are given for the selection of the temple site, the building of the temple, the choice of materials like wood and stone, the production of various kinds of idols, their installation, proper methods of worship, and detailed prescriptions regarding the celebration of private and public festivals and rituals for the expiation of sins of omission and commission.

Vikhanas is the author of the *Dharma*, *Gṛhya* and *Śrauta sūtras*, which he is claimed to have compiled under the direct guidance and instruction of Viṣṇu. He is identified with Brahmā, who is credited with the authorship of the Sūtras. The *Kalpa-sūtras* enjoin the worship of Viṣṇu and give directions for His worship; they are stated to be in consonance with the contents of the *Vedas*.

The *Tāṇḍya-Brāhmaṇa* (XIV.9.29), *Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa* (I.9.5), *Ārṣeya-Brāhmaṇa* (I.62), and *Taittiriya-Āraṇyaka* (XXIII.3) mention the name Vaikhānasa. The *Dharma-sūtras* of Baudhāyana (II.6.16), the *Gṛhya-sūtras* of both Agniveśa (II.6.5) and Baudhāyana (II.9.17), and the *Śrauta-sūtras* of both Baudhāyana (XVI.24.8) and Hiranyakeśin (XIX.3.14) cite Vikhanas as the authority for ritualistic practice in certain contexts.

According to the tradition, Vikhanas had nine pupils: Kāśyapa, Atri, Marīci, Vasiṣṭha, Aṅgiras, Bhṛgu, Pulastya, Pulaha and Kratu. Among these Kāśyapa, Atri, Marīci and Bhṛgu are known to have composed their own Āgama texts. (The works of the

others, if indeed they ever existed, are non-extant.) We will now briefly examine four Vaikhānasa Āgama texts.

Atri: Atri is one of the four disciples of Vikhanas and his work is known by the name *Samūrtārcanādhikaraṇa*. As indicated by the name, this work gives the detailed procedure for image worship in the temples. This book has been published by Tirumala Tirupati Devasthanams.

Bhṛgu: Bhṛgu is supposed to have composed a number of *Adhikāras* pertaining to Vaikhānasa rituals. Very few of them are available in print. The *Jñānādhikāra* and *Khilādhikāra* were printed long back in Telugu script. Later on, Tirumala Tirupati Devasthanams brought out in Devanāgarī the *Khilādhikāra*, *Kriyādhikāra* and *Vāsādhikāra*.

In their introductory chapter, *Kriyādhikāra* and *Khilādhikāra* (like any Āgama text) explain the origin and appearance of the work. Again and again their author-ṛṣi tries to establish the authenticity of the Āgama by regarding it as on par with the *Vedas*. Indeed, the worship of Viṣṇu is the essence of the *Vedas* according to Bhṛgu:

This (worship of Viṣṇu) about which you have asked me is the essence of the *Vedas*, and to understand this is very difficult even for the gods, and it is impossible even with the power of penance acquired in many births (*Khilādhikāra*, I. 10b & 11).

In *Kriyādhikāra*, the superiority of image worship to Yoga is established. The reason given is an interesting one: image worship is considered to be superior to other forms of worship because it pleases the eyes as well as the mind, thus leading to Bhakti; this is a crucial point, considering the fact that, according to the Āgama, lord Hari can be attained only by Bhakti.

Marīci: The *Marīci-saṃhitā* is supposed to have been authored by Mahārṣi Marīci. The beginning of the work, known as *granthāvatāra*, which relates the way in which the Āgama first appeared, is found in most Saṃhitā texts. Quite typically, the first

chapter is presented as a discussion between the ṛṣis and Marīci. The ṛṣis ask Marīci by which *mantras* the Lord is to be worshipped and where the worshippers go after the worship. Marīci answers:

Worshipping the benign Paramātman Nārāyaṇa with the *mantras* which appeared from the Four Vedas, the worshippers reach the eternal *paramapada* which is beyond the reach of the gods and the sense organs and which is superior to all others.

Here Marīci is very specific about the 'worship of the image', a procedure salient to worship as prescribed in the Āgamas, but not found in the Vedas. Marīci forthrightly says that this worship of the image is in conformity with the Vedas, that is, that image-worship is not contrary to the Vedas. One way in which the text links image-worship to the Vedas is through the use of *mantras*. The *mantras* to be used in the worship of the image have themselves appeared in the Vedas. Here too, the author is very careful to establish the Vedic foundation of Āgamic worship by using the word *caturvedodbhava-mantra* meaning 'the Mantras which are the outcome of the Four Vedas'. Furthermore, he calls this treatise *Vimānārcanakaḥ*. The author himself defines the word *vimāna*: *vimāna* denotes that Paramapurūṣa, who is also known by other terms such as *paraṃ brahman*, *paraṃ jyotis* and *akṣara* and also who is the form of the five elements (*pañcabhūta*), the support (*ādhāra*) of everything and eternal (*sanātana*). Therefore, the Lord's worship (*arcana*) is called *Vimānārcana*. The conclusion of this chapter is comprised of a discussion about the two kinds of *ārādhana* 'worship': *amūrta* (formless) and *samūrta* (with form). The offering made into the fire is called *amūrta*, while image-worship is called *samūrta*. The author openly states that *samūrta* worship is superior to *amūrta* because even in the absence of *yajamāna* 'master', it will continue without any obstruction for ever. Hence, image-worship provides all kinds of fruits which are to be attained by Vedic *yajñas*. Also, *samūrta* worship fulfills all desires of the individual.

The *Marīci-saṃhitā* has one hundred and one *paṭalas* (divisions), starting from the selection of the site for the temple and

town, it gives the details of temple construction, materials for construction of the different types and different parts of the temple, consecration of the icon, prescriptions for daily worship, reconciliation ritual for sins of commission and omission, and finally, it describes the crossing of *saṃsāra* and the attainment of the final goal and the importance of Yoga.

Kāśyapa: Kāśyapa's work, known as *Kāśyapa-saṃhitā*, is also known as *Kāśyapa-jñānakāṇḍa*. Like Marīci, Kāśyapa established that image worship is complete because, even in the absence of an *yajamāna*, *pūjā* (worship) can take place. Image worship fulfills both worldly and heavenly desires. This *pūjā* is divided into two forms: *śāntikam* and *pauṣṭikam*. *Śāntikam* provides peace for everyone and *pauṣṭikam* provides prosperity to everyone without any discrimination by *jāti* or sex.

Vaikhānasāgamas - Conclusion: From the study of these four important Vaikhānasa *saṃhitās* it will be noticed that every ṛṣi or author deals with the problem of the authenticity of his Āgama and argues for its authenticity on the basis of its being on par with the *Vedas*. This particular discussion, included uniformly in the beginning of every work, gives the clue that although image worship is not found in the *Vedas*, it was being followed by many in the society. Each author attempts to provide a Vedic sanction for these non-Vedic practices.

Regarding the installation of the icons and the necessity of worship, the question is generally raised that – the Lord being all-pervasive, that is, present everywhere – why should there be an invocation (*āvāhana*) and dismissal (*visarjana*) of the deity? The Vaikhānasa Āgamas answer the question thus: Although the Lord is all-pervasive, invocation means inviting Him through *mantras* and requesting Him to be in one particular place to receive worship. Why is this necessary? Because otherwise, even the gods cannot adore Him! When so invoked, He is described in the Āgamas as compressing His expansive form out of kindness for His devotees, just as the peacock folds its tail-plumes, Viṣṇu shines in the heart of the devotees who meditate upon Him as the fire in the forest blazes forth in a particular place. Later on in this paper, we

will discuss some of the important non-Vedic rituals found in the *saṃhitās*.

III

The Pāñcarātra Āgamas are said to have been revealed by Lord Nārāyaṇa Himself, and it is for this reason that this literature is called *bhagavad śāstra*. Its origin is usually traced to the *Ekāyana-śākhā* of the *Śuklayajurveda*. The Pāñcarātra system is known by various names, such as: *Ekāyana*, *Sāttvata*, *Aikāntika*, *Bhāgavata*, and so forth. The earliest accounts of some of the Pāñcarātra doctrines are found in the *Śāntiparvan* of the *Mahābhārata*. There we also come across a graphic description of the way in which these doctrines were revealed by the Lord to the seven *citraśikhaṇḍins*. Unfortunately there is no clear evidence as to exactly when the *Samhitā* texts, as they exist now, were composed.

The injunctions prescribed in these Pāñcarātra Āgamas, along with those found in the corpus of the complementary Vaikhānasa school – and perhaps more often the rules found in the derivative popular manuals of each school – account for, and give sacred authority to, the bulk of the activities undertaken in temples, in public celebrations and in homes by large numbers of Viṣṇu-worshippers today. Even so, the Pāñcarātra Āgamas are primarily *mokṣa-śāstras* and claim a Vedic foundation for their doctrines. The distinguishing feature of the Pāñcarātra Āgama is its catholicity and spirit of accommodation. Women and *sūdras*, considered ineligible for the study of *Śruti*, were admitted by Pāñcarātrins into the fold of *mokṣa-sādhana*. It is almost certain that this very distinguishing feature of these Āgamas came in the way of their being recognized by Vedic orthodoxy. Indeed, their first extant defence in the South may be traced to the 11th century A.D. (cf. Yāmuna's *Āgamaprāmāṇya* and Rāmānuja's *Śrībhāṣya*, 2.2.41-42). While Vaikhānasa practices were open only to members of acceptable and high-status communities, Pāñcarātra was designed to accommodate anyone who desired access to the worship of Viṣṇu, after getting the necessary initiation (*dīkṣā*).

Etymologies of the word 'pañcarātra': The word *pañcarātra* is interpreted variously in different *Samhitās*. The *Pādma-*

saṃhitā (I.1.73), refers to *rātra* as a 'night', and views the five Āgamas of the Śaivas, the Sāṃkhya-Yogins, the Arhats and the Bauddhas as being thrown into the shade of Pāñcarātra. According to *Īśvara-saṃhitā*, the reference is to Nārāyaṇa, who is said to have bestowed enlightenment upon five ṛṣis - Śaṇḍilya, Aupagāyana, Maurjāyana, Kauśika, and Bhāradvāja - in five nights (11.52.582). *Śrīpraśna-saṃhitā* understands the word *rātra* as *ajñāna*, which is dispelled by Pāñcarātra (2.39-40). *Nārada-pāñcarātra* defines *rātra* as 'knowledge', and *pāñcarātra* as 'five kinds of knowledge': *tattva* (cosmology), *mukti-prada* (liberation), *bhakti-prada* (devotion), *yaugika* (Yoga), and *vaiṣayika* (the objects of sense) (1.1.44). Sometimes the word *pāñcarātra* is split thus: *pañca+rā+tra*. *Pañca* then is said to refer to the five essential substances, the five sense-organs, and the five objects of sense. *Rā* means *adana*, the man who receives all these, and *tra* refers to the protection given to the man who receives all these (*Viśvāmitra-saṃhitā* 2.3.5).

The general nature of Pāñcarātra is interpreted differently by *Śrīpraśna-saṃhitā*, according to which Pāñcarātra refers to the five aspects of God: Para, Vyūha, Vibhava, Arcā, and Antaryāmin (2.38-39).

Three gems: Traditionally the number of works comprising the canon of the Pāñcarātra school is said to be 'one hundred and eight'; F.O. Schrader,¹ the pioneer western scholar in this field, as well as Indian scholars (notably V. Krishnamacharya²), indicate that the actual number of titles recounted in various lists comes to well over two hundred. Many of those works, if they ever in fact existed, have long since been 'lost'. But a significant number have been preserved³ and some published; a number of others are well preserved in manuscript form, with many fragments of varying lengths. These extant texts provide us with sufficient evidence to sense what the literature must once have been like.

Pāñcarātra traditions, both written and oral, accord the greatest authority to three particular texts in the canon of the 'one hundred and eight works'. The three are collectively referred to as the 'Three Gems' (*ratnatraya*). These three - *Jayākhya*, *Sāttvata* and *Paushkara saṃhitās* - also appear to be among the most

ancient of all the Pāñcarātra Āgamas⁴. The three have been linked together since as early as c. 10th century A.D.

The 'Three Gems' are mentioned together in *Īśvara-saṃhitā* I.64⁵ another important *saṃhitā* of the canon, while *Parameśvara-saṃhitā*, another major Pāñcarātra text highly honoured at Srirangam, reverentially not only mentions the three together at least twice (I.19), but suggests that the three are set apart from other canonical works also because they are *divya* (X.376). The Gems are mentioned with the prefix *śrī* in the tenth century by the Kashmir Saivite Utpala in his *Spandaprādīpikā*.⁶ In Vedānta Deśika's 14th century defence of the Āgama tradition entitled *Pāñcarātrarakṣā*,⁷ the three *saṃhitās* are joined together as a triumvirate. Their names, to be sure, often appear in canonical lists in other *saṃhitās*, but their relative positions in those lists are more often determined by the *śloka* meter than by other considerations.

Each of the three is traditionally associated with a centre of Śrī Vaiṣṇava piety (*Jayākhyā* with Conjeevaram, *Sāttvata* with Melkote and *Pauṣkara* with Srirangam), and each has traditionally been associated with a second 'dependant' text which has through the centuries become more popular and widely-used than its model (*Jayākhyā* with *Pādma-saṃhitā*, *Sāttvata* with *Īśvara-saṃhitā*, *Pauṣkara* with *Parameśvara-saṃhitā*). In addition to the 'Three Gems', *Śrīpraśna-saṃhitā* must also be included as one of the most important *saṃhitās* of the Pāñcarātra tradition.

Style and structure of the Pāñcarātra-saṃhitās: The Pāñcarātra Āgamas generally contain four divisions: *Jñāna*, *Yoga*, *Kriyā* and *Caryā*. *Jñāna*, the first division, deals with the nature of the Ultimate Reality and its five-fold aspect, that is *Para*, *Vyūha*, *Vibhava*, *Antaryāmin* and *Arcā*. The Pāñcarātra *saṃhitās* variously refer to the Ultimate Reality as *Śrīmannārāyaṇa*, *Vāsudeva*, *Viṣṇu* and *Bhagavān*. We find a systematic treatment of the concept of Brahman as the object to be attained. *Ahīrbudhnya-saṃhitā* (XI.63a, 64b) states that the system called Pāñcarātra – which describes the Lord as *Para*, *Vyūha*, *Vibhava*, etc., – is recognizable by having liberation as its sole support. Some of the Āgama texts refer to Brahman's three aspects: *para* 'supreme', *sthūla* 'gross' and *sūkṣma* 'subtle'; while others refer to

niṣkala-sakala, *niṣkala*, and *sakala*. That these various classificatory systems refer to one and the same Ultimate Reality is demonstrated in the following table:

<i>Para</i> (supreme)	Viṣṇu's blissful transcendental <i>niṣkala</i> form
<i>Sūkṣma</i> (subtle)	That form in which He dwells - <i>sakala-niṣkala</i> as the heart of all beings. This is a stage when Brahman begins to undergo emanation.
<i>Sthūla</i> (gross)	The form taken by Him - <i>sakala</i> for creation, sustenance, and so forth of the universe - the gross manifested form.

Jñānapāda and the Five Forms of Brahman: Brahman is often referred to as *ṣaḍguṇya-vigraha* in the Āgamas. Representative of a host of auspicious qualities, the famous 'six qualities' – often listed as *bala*, *aśvarya*, *vīrya*, *śakti* and *tejas*⁸ – are in no way exhaustive. Brahman is resplendent with these divine attributes. Thus Brahman, according to the Pāñcarātrins, is *saguṇa*. But the *saṃhitās* state that Brahman, who is *ṣaḍguṇya*, may on occasion be defined as *nirguṇa*; this simply indicates that the six attributes of Brahman should not be confused with the three *guṇas* of Prakṛti. *Nirguṇa* thus does not mean 'attributeless'; rather, Brahman is always and everywhere *triguṇātīta*. *Ahīrbudhnya-saṃhitā* II.54-55 clearly states: *aprākṛta-guṇa-sparsaṃ nirguṇaṃ parijīyate*. As in Rāmānuja's writings, *heyopādeya* is used in *Ahīrbudhnya-saṃhitā* II.25 to show that Brahman is replete with all auspicious qualities (*kalyāṇaguṇa*), is *ṣaḍguṇya-vigraha*, and is opposed to anything defiling.

Vyūha: *Vyūha* is the next form of the Lord discussed in the Āgamas. The *vyūhas* serve as a *via-media* to relate the Supreme Brahman – who is pure consciousness and who possesses all auspicious qualities (*kalyāṇaguṇa-pūrṇa*) – with the impure universe. The Pāñcarātra texts describe creation in three stages: (1) *śuddha-sṛṣṭi* (pure), (2) *suddhāśuddha-sṛṣṭi* (pure-impure or mixed), and (3) *asuddha-sṛṣṭi* (impure). The Āgamas further give an account of the emanation of the *vyūha* forms from Parabrahman under *śuddha-sṛṣṭi*.

The *vyūha* concept is described both in the context of creation and in the context of making the worship of God possible in the *kriyā* and *Caryā* portions of the *Āgamas*. Creation in the *Pāñcarātra* texts is explained to take place due to the will of the Lord (*Lakṣmī-tantra* II.36-37). When the will to create arises in Brahman the attributes which were dormant till then start slowly manifesting, until they become more and more pronounced. The whole process of creation is said to take place in three stages. The *Āgamas* are very specific about one fact, namely, that it is the *Śakti* aspect of the Lord which undergoes this transformation (*Lakṣmī-tantra* II.20.23).

The three stages of creation are: (1) when the presence of the attributes is assumed (when the *ṣaḍguṇas* are not yet discernible), (2) when the attributes are in the process of becoming discernible, and lastly (3) when the *guṇas* have fully manifested. The six *guṇas* combine in three pairs and the four manifestations follow out of such a combination. It can thus be seen that the *śramabhūmi*, that is, the active *guṇas* (*jñāna*, *aiśvarya* and *śakti*) are responsible for the activities, and the *viśrāmbhūmi*, that is, the inert *guṇas* (*bala* and *jñāna*) are responsible for their ethical functions. The above can be represented as follows:

Vāsudeva	The six <i>guṇas</i> in an unmanifested form
Vyūha Vāsudeva	<i>Jñāna</i> , <i>bala</i> , <i>aiśvarya</i> , <i>vīrya</i> , <i>śakti</i> and <i>tejas</i>
San̄karaṣaṇa	<i>Jñāna</i> - destruction (cosmic) <i>Bala</i> - teaching of the <i>śāstras</i> (ethical)
Pradyumna	<i>Aiśvarya</i> - sustenance (cosmic) <i>Vīrya</i> - practice of <i>śāstras</i> (ethical)
Aniruddha	<i>Śakti</i> - creation (cosmic) <i>Tejas</i> - Liberation (ethical)

It is clearly set forth in these *Pāñcarātra* texts that the *vyūhas* are responsible for the creation, maintenance and destruction of the universe. The active *guṇas* (*jñāna*, *aiśvarya*, and *śakti*) are responsible for the cosmological functions, and the inert *guṇas*, which start functioning after creation, are responsible for the ethical activities, as detailed above. The sole motive behind the creation is the Lord's will.

Vibhavāvatāra: The *Lakṣmī-tantra*, *Ahīrbudhnya-saṃhitā* and *Sāttvata-saṃhitā* give elaborate accounts of the *vibhavāvatāra* form of the Lord. This form represents the concrete manifestation of the Lord in the world for a particular purpose. *Vibhavas* are of two types: primary and secondary. The *Sāttvata-saṃhitā* (IX and X), *Ahīrbudhnya-saṃhitā* (V.50ff) and *Lakṣmī-tantra* (IX.19-25) mention thirtynine such *avatāra* forms.

Antaryāmin and Arcāvatāra: *Antaryāmin* is the Lord who dwells in all living beings as Inner Controller. The Lord as present in the hearts of the Yogins is called *hārda*. Yogins meditate on the Lord in this form. However, the chief concern of the Āgamas seems to be to bring the pursuit of the divine into the reach of the common man. The *arcā* form of God is especially suitable for this, since it is the most easily comprehensible and most easily accessible form in which the Lord's motherly affection (*vātsalya*) is fully manifest. The concept of salvation by surrender (*prapatti*), highly developed in the Pāñcarātra literature, is centered on this form of the Lord.

The question that naturally occurs is why the Lord assumes these different forms. The *Lakṣmī-tantra* (XI.47b-51 and XI.41) states:

Considering the differences in the mental qualities of the devotees still afflicted by the illusion of egoism and selfishness and so fit (to understand God in different degrees of perfection). He assumes states of existence in different levels known as *para*, *vyūha*, and so forth. The purpose of the diverse manifestation of the Supreme God as *para*, *vyūha* and so forth is to benefit human beings and show compassion towards His devotees.

The *Jñānapāda* section of the Āgamas thus describe the several forms of the Lord.

Yogapāda: The *Yogapāda* section of the Āgamas discuss the methods which the self has to practice the realization of the nature of the Ultimate Reality. These are by and large based on the *Yoga-sūtras* of Patañjali and Haṭha-yoga. This path has had a

very limited appeal, since only a few persons, extraordinary in status and individual characteristics, could adopt the difficult Yogic practices.

Correspondingly, the Pāñcarātra *saṃhitās* advocate another *mokṣopāya* in addition to the well-known *Jñāna-yoga*, *Bhakti-yoga*, and *Karma-yoga*. All of the following important texts deal with *prapatti* in great detail – *Ahīrbudhnya-saṃhitā*, *Lakṣmī-tantra*, *Śrīpraśna-saṃhitā*, *Parama-saṃhitā*, *Sanatkumāra-saṃhitā*, *Sāttvata-saṃhitā* and *Īśvara-saṃhitā*.

In the seventh chapter of *Lakṣmī-tantra*, *prapatti* is called 'the secret method of self-surrender'. The *Lakṣmī-tantra* (V.213-222) explains all of the elements connected with the concept. In a dialogue between Śakra and Śrī, Śrī elaborates *prapatti* as follows:

Having taken refuge with me [Śrī] or with God the Supreme Person, the adept who is full of faith and self-restrained should attain us in the following manner. [Let him/her say]: "As far as my ability and character permit, I refrain (*prātikūlyam parityajya*) from any adverseness towards, and am well-disposed (*ānukūlyam ca*) towards, all creatures..... . Since you [Śrī] are a woman, weak and ignorant, the three methods [of attaining God] described in religious texts, cannot avail me. Although I seek no gain for any function that I perform here in obedience to their bidding, because [I am] helpless (*akiñcana*), poor, humble and unprotected, my only means of survival is by taking shelter under your cooling shadow. O Unlimited Sovereign Mistress of us all and Resort of Compassion, every scripture sings that you are the sole refuge.

Thus the first and foremost requirement necessary for *prapatti* is the realization by the seeker of his total helplessness and inability to follow other prescribed paths. He then resorts to *prapatti* with faith in its efficacy. Such supreme faith is called *mahāviśvāsa*. Such a supreme faith arises only when one realizes that the relationship

between the Lord and the soul is that of 'protector and protected' (*Lakṣmī-tantra* XVII.71-72a).

Prapatti has other different *aṅgas* or accessories. These are:

- (1) *Prātikūlyavarjana*: There should be an active effort on the part of the *prapanna* to refrain from doing any harm to other beings, based on the knowledge that the Lord resides in every being (*Lakṣmī-tantra* XVII.66-67).
- (2) *Ānukūlyasaṅkalpa*: The devotee should be well disposed towards everyone based on the conviction that Śrī exists in all beings (*Ahīrbudhnya-saṃhitā* LII.21-23).
- (3) *Goptṛtvavaraṇa*: There should be an active effort on the part of the individual to win the grace of the Lord (*Lakṣmī-tantra* XVII.73). Although God is the master of all embodied beings and although He is full of compassion and capable of showing it, yet without solicitation, He will not protect. [This consideration is inducement] to pray [by introducing one's prayer with the words:] "Be my protector", which implies throwing oneself on His protection.
- (4) *Kārpaṇya*: Dispensing with all other prescribed means and then resorting to *prapatti* from a feeling of lowliness and timidity is what is known as *kārpaṇya*. *Kārpaṇya* causes an individual to renounce all other means and resort to *prapatti*, but *goptṛtvavaraṇa* makes an individual adhere to *prapatti* as an *upāya* (*Lakṣmī-tantra* XVII.68, 78-79a).
- (5) *Ātmanikṣepa*: Self-surrender starts with waiving the right to claim the results of the deeds performed by those who rely solely on God's protection and ends with relinquishing those privileges in favour of Keśava (*Lakṣmī-tantra* XVII.74).

Prapatti is generally said to have five *aṅgas*. *Ātmanikṣepa*, which is sometimes referred to as the sixth *aṅga*, denotes the actual surrender itself (*Lakṣmī-tantra* XVII.75).

The *Lakṣmī-tantra* XVII.75 points out the various synonyms used for *prapatti*. They are *nyāsa*, *nikṣepa*, *sannyāsa*, *tyāga* and *śaraṇāgati*.

Adhikāra for Prapatti: The Pāñcarātra Āgamas teach *prapatti* as one of the *mokṣopāyas*. For the other *mokṣopāyas*,

neither *sūdras* nor women are eligible. *Prapatti*, as elaborated in the *Āgamas*, however, is presented as a *sādhana* fit to be practised by one and all. *Lakṣmī-tantra* (XVI.41-44 and XVII.105) clearly states that *prapatti* is the simplest method of all to follow, for as *Lakṣmī* says:

Thus I have preached to you the three exalted methods (for attaining the Highest Goal). Now listen to my description of the fourth method called complete surrender or renunciation. It consists of (the adept's) abandonment of every task however weighty or trifling. Having been made thoroughly miserable by the fire of worldly existence, he (the adept) resorts to me alone (*saṃsārā-nalasantapto mām ekaṃ śaraṇaṃ vrajet*).

Lakṣmī further adds: "Complete self-surrender is a means simple to follow, but in my opinion it is difficult to carry out."

The *Ahīrbudhnya-saṃhitā* lists the various *mantras* and their meanings. This *saṃhitā* further points out that the word *namaḥ*, occurring in a variety of *mantras*, implies surrender. The *Saṃhitās* also give a detailed description concerning the appropriate conduct of a *prapanna*, and the method of worship of *arcāvatāra*.

Kriyāpāda: The *Kriyāpāda* section of the *Āgamas* offers elaborate details as to how temples are to be constructed, how, and from what materials, images are to be prepared and installed, and the like. To a Hindu an image is a symbol exhibiting certain aspects of a deity he has chosen to concentrate upon. Image worship is thus regarded by all as a necessary step in the spiritual advancement of man, and – in the *Āgamas* – has no stigma attached to it, for the human being cannot conceive of anything without a mental image.

Caryāpāda: The fourth *pāda* of the *Āgamas* is *Caryā-pāda*. This section lays down rules regarding the daily routine of the aspirants for the worship of God in temples. This section stresses the practical side of the religious life. Whereas in Vedāntic religion the practical aspect is regarded as the least important, the *Āgamas*

consider the practical aspects of their teachings as being just as important as the philosophical and religious aspects.

The *Caryā-pāda* prescribes the worship of God by means of *mantras*. *Mantras* are constituted of syllabic sounds which represent the power of God. An aspirant has to choose a letter or a syllable, which gets formed into a *mantra* gradually, and then use the *mantra* for worship of God. *Mantra* manifests God, and in this kind of worship, *mantra* and deity become one; indeed, the letters of the *mantra* become the *yantra* or idol of God. When the *mantra* is pronounced properly and intonated properly, the deity manifests in the *yantra*.

IV

Now we shall examine some of the important rituals which are non-Vedic in nature but very important in the Āgamic tradition. One such ritual is *Aṅkurārpaṇa*.

***Aṅkurārpaṇa*:** *Aṅkurārpaṇa*, important in the Āgamas, is an integral part of both Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava ritual. An examination of the origin and development of *Aṅkurārpaṇa* ceremony serves to highlight the fact that a common indigenous tradition underlies both Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava temple ritual.

Aṅkurārpaṇa consists of germination rites. It is one of the important preliminary rituals adopted before certain temple rituals, before social functions like marriage, and before a few other *saṃskāras* in South India. In this ritual, nine varieties of pulses are sown in special containers called *pālikās* so that they will sprout before the ceremony begins. The term *aṅkurārpaṇa* means both 'planting a shoot' and 'a kind of nuptial ceremony.'⁹ It is important to note that no rite by this name is mentioned in the Vedic texts. The Āgama-saṃhitās, on the other hand, prescribe it as a necessary part of most ritual undertakings, and it is an essential component of many important ritual performances (including marriage) in South India even today. Therefore, we suggest that because the Vedic texts do not mention this ritual, and since this ritual is practiced by both Śaivas and Vaiṣṇavas, its origin must certainly be in the indigenous tradition. It was most probably adopted into Vedic rituals only later on. Indeed, the absorption

of indigenous practices into the Vedic ritual is supported by the *Gṛhya-sūtras* of Āpastamba and Āśvalāyana.

Pañca-saṃskāra: The five saṃskāras are

- (1) *Tāpa-saṃskāra:* The marking of the aspirant's right and left shoulders with hot metal inscribed with the symbols of Viṣṇu's *cakra* and *śaṅkha*.
- (2) *Puṇḍra-saṃskāra:* The drawing of the the Tiruman (with white clay) and Śrīcūrṇa on the disciple's forehead and eleven other places of the body.
- (3) *Nāma-saṃskāra:* The giving of a new name to the disciple by the Ācārya.
- (4) *Mantra:* The Ācārya's whispering into the disciple's ear the *aṣṭākṣara-mantra*, the *dvaya* and the *carama-sloka*.
- (5) *Yāga:* The disciple is provided with a deity to worship.

This *pañca-saṃskāra-dīkṣā* is required for all Śrīvaiṣṇavas, and is administered without any discrimination as to caste, creed or sex. The first among the parts of this five-fold ritual is definitely non-Vedic. Even today, Vaidikas object to the validity of *tāpa-saṃskāra*, while according to Pāñcarātra *tāpa-saṃskāra* is a basic requirement to become eligible for *svārtha-pūjā* (*pūjā* performed for the self), and *parārtha-pūjā* (*pūjā* performed for others). This important ritual has been mentioned by Periyālvār.¹⁰

Conclusions

Like parts of the *pañca-saṃskāra* ceremony, the afore mentioned *prapatti* as a way to reach God is derived from a non-Vedic indigenous tradition. *Śaraṇāgati* or *prapatti* is a central feature of South Indian Bhakti literature. What is most interesting from our perspective is that the concept is common to both the Vaiṣṇava Ālvārs and the Śaiva Nāyanmārs. This main *mārga* (path) – which is accessible to all without any discrimination – is a gift of the indigenous Dravidian Bhakti movement.

Further substantiation of our argument that many Āgamic practices originated in the indigenous tradition is the fact that a number of non-Sanskritic terms, freely used in Āgamic literature, are taken from the Tamil language. Thus our analysis of the Āgamic tradition leads us to safely arrive at the following conclusions: (1) Image worship, being non-Vedic, is a gift of the indigenous traditions; (2) Āgamas, which are written in the Sanskrit language, appear to have as one of their major agendas the establishment of pan-Indian status to non-Vedic rituals and traditions; (3) Like *aṅkurārpaṇa*, *raṅṣābandhana* and other rituals and ceremonies now followed throughout India, indigenous practices included in the Āgamic traditions irritated the adherents of paths based on the *Veda*, such as Yoga, etc., until the 10th century A.D.; (4) The defence of the Āgamic tradition began with Jayantabhaṭṭa in Kashmir (9th century A.D.) and was continued in South India by Yāmuna (11th century A.D.), Rāmānuja (11th century A.D.), and Vedāntadeśika (13th century A.D.) in the South.

REFERENCES

1. F.O. Schraeder, *Introduction to the Pāñcarātra and the Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā*, pp. 6-12.
2. See the Sanskrit Introduction to *Lakṣmī-tantra*, ed. V. Krishnamacharya, pp. 10-13.
3. In the *Pāñcarātra-nūl-viḷakkam* (published in Tamil translation; English title given on alternate title page as *Panorama of Pāñcarātra Literature*), the author has located and described 104 preserved pieces of varying lengths, pp.112.
4. The earliest date suggested for any of the works takes us back to about 450 C.E., according to B. Bhattacharya in his "Forward" to *Jayākhyā-saṃhitā* (ed. Embar Krishnamacharya), pp. 26-35. See also Schraeder, op. cit. p.20.
Some of the other works, also widely regarded as cononical, appear to be as late as the 17th century. The period of greatest productivity in the Pāñcarātra textual enterprise was probably in the centuries on either side of Rāmānuja, the champion of Pāñcarātra ways. But the historical processes that defined and redefined the canonicity of texts is still unclear to us, both in the earlier and in the later phases.
5. *Īśvara-saṃhitā* (Conjeevaram, 1923) (Devanagari script). See also the edition of Mysore (Sadvidyā Press, 1890, Telugu script).

See Schraeder, op.cit. p.16 for dating this *Samhitā* prior to Yāmuna. For problems involved in an early date, see also H. Daniel Smith's *Descriptive Catalogue of the Printed Texts of the Pāñcarātrāgamā*, p.85.

6. According to B. Bhattacharya, op.cit. p.12, it may be noted that although Rāmānuja quotes from both the *Pauṣkara* and *Sāttvata samhitās*, he does not deem to attach any extraordinary status to them.
7. *yathoktaṃ sākṣādbhagavanmukhodgatatayā ratnatrayam iti prasiddheṣu jayākhyā-sāttvata-pauṣkareṣu...*, *Pāñcarātrarakṣā*, ch.2, p.42 (Adyar Library Series 36, 1942).
8. *Ahīrbudhnyā-samhitā* XIII. 5b and II.7a, 53b, *Lakṣmī-tantra* XI.2.
9. Monier Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, New edition (Delhi, 1981), p. 1309.
10. *Tiruppalāṇḍu* 7: "Bearing [on our upper arms] the imprint of holy *Cakra* [or *Sudarśana*], caused by the special consecrated instrument with the red-hot wheel-emblem which is blazing more fiercely than fire, we have been at the Lord's service, generation after generation.

MUSIC AND MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS IN NATYASAstra

“What is production (*prayoga*)?” asks Bharata and answers that “it is the union of song, instrument and action.”¹ The pivotal importance Bharata attaches to music in the play production can be understood from this pronouncement. In fact the great theatrician envisages a production which is characterized by song, instrument, word and action flowing in an unbroken sequence, like a fire wheel (*alātacakra*).² Music, again is likened to a bed, wherein the play-production rests. Just as a drawing cannot be beautiful without colour, so drama also cannot be beautiful without music.³ The musical orientation of Bharata’s theatre will be clear from the fact that not less than three musical concepts, viz., *svara*, *gāna* and *ātodya* figure in the eleven items of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* mentioned by him. The adage *amṛdaṅgam nāṭakam*, which is roughly equivalent to ‘Hamlet without the Prince of Denmark’ sums up the importance attached to music and musical instruments in Sanskrit theatre.

Theatre music as envisaged in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* manifests at four levels. First of all, the preliminary rituals (*pūrvaraṅga*) consist of the placement and tuning of the musical instruments to set the tune

by speech. The *dhruvā* song to be rendered on specific occasions is another important musical element. Finally, we have to consider the musical *svaras* assigned to various *rasas* by Bharata to get an overall picture of the musical dimensions in acting.

It goes without saying that instrumental music is as important as vocal music, if not more, in Bharata's theatre. Not many people realise that the classification of instruments prevalent throughout the world owes its origin to India, and it is in Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* that we find its first reference.⁴ Bharata refers to four varieties of instruments: *ghana* (solid or idiophones), *avanaddha* (covered vessels or drums), *suśira* (hollow or wind instruments) and *tata* (stretched or stringed instruments). Among these, solid instruments do not have much resonating capacity and are used only for keeping the rhythmic beat (*tāla*). The percussion instruments include *mṛdaṅga*, *paṇava*, *dardura*, *bherī*, *paṭaha*, *jhañjhā*, *dundubhi*, *ḍiṇḍima*, etc. Bharata records that there were about a hundred types of percussion instruments vogue in his time. The stringed instruments mentioned by Bharata include *vipañcī* and *citraviṇā*. The lute with seven strings is called *citraviṇā* and that which has nine strings in *vipañcī*.

The musical system followed in the *Nāṭyaśāstrā* represents the pre-rāga phase of Indian music. We can describe it as *mūrchanā-paddhati* in contrast with the later phase of music which can be called *melapaddhati*. A hall-mark of this system is the conception of melodious entities taking place due to modal shifts. *Mūrchanā* consists of heptatonic serial progression and the change of the basic note resulted in the emergence of several melodies which are described as *jātis*. Bharata refers to two parent scales called *śaḍja-grāma* and *madhyama-grāma* which served as the basis of these modes of music. The *mā-grāma* differed from the *sā-grāma* only in one microtone (*śruti*) with regard to the *pañcama*⁵ note and this served as the measurement of microtone itself and was designated as *pramāṇaśruti*, for measuring the 22 microtones of the octave. According to N.A. Jairazbhoy, the *sā-grāma* corresponds with the 'D' mode, the Ecclesiastic Dorian and the *mā-grāma* to the 'G' mode, the Ecclesiastic Mixolydian.⁶

Seven modal sequences derived from these two parental grāmas, and their difference was simply because of the tonal inferiority of the *pa*-note in the *ma*-grāma. Among the seven pairs of *mūrchanas*, four of the *sa*-grāma and three of the *ma*-grāma were regarded as pure mode (*śuddha-jāti*) and the others were regarded as modified notes (*vikṛta-jāti*). The *jāti*s, for all practical purposes corresponded with the *rāga* of later music and had ten characteristics called *graha* (starting note), *aṃśa* (dominant notes), *tāra* (upper limit), *mandra* (lower limit), *nyāsa* (final note), *apanyāsa* (secondary final), *alpatva* (less frequent notes), *bahutva* (more frequent notes), *ṣāḍavita* (hexatonic quality which consists of the note which is omitted to make *jāti* hexatonic) and *auḍavita* (pentatonic quality, i.e. the note which makes the mode pentatonic when omitted).⁷

Many of these technical concepts persist in modern Rāga music also since we speak about the gamut of the *rāga*, the predominant note, etc., in *rāgas* also. However, the main difference between *rāga* and *jāti* lies in that the latter could be sung in heptatonic, hexatonic and pentatonic forms, using seven, six and five notes of the parent scale respectively, which is not seen in *rāga*, which is a more rigid musical entity. The allocation of several *aṃśas* to one *jāti* is also indicative of the diversity possible in the rendering of them which is quite absent in *rāga* system.⁸

Of all, Bharata mentioned seven *mūrchanas* in *ṣaḍja-grāma* and seven in *madhyama-grāma*. The *mūrchanas* of *ṣaḍjagrāma* are *uttaramandrā*, *rajanī*, *uttarāyatā*, *śuddha-ṣaḍjā*, *matsarikṛta*, *aśvakrāntā*, and *abhirudgata*, with their initial notes in descending order from *sā* and *nī*. The seven *mūrchanas* of *madhyama-grāma* are *sauvīrī*, *hariṇāśvā*, *kālopanatā*, *śuddha-madhyā*, *mārgī*, *pauravī* and *hr̥ṣyakā*. The initial notes of these are in descending order from *mā*. The *jāti*s originating from *ṣaḍja-grāma* are seven, viz., *ṣaḍjī*, *ārṣabhī*, *dhaivati*, *naiṣāḍī*, *ṣaḍjodicyavati*, *ṣaḍjakaiśikī*, and *ṣaḍja-madhyamā*.⁹ There are eleven *jāti*s which are produced from *madhyama-grāma*, viz., *gāndhārī*, *rakta-gāndhārī*, *gāndharodicyavā*, *madhyamodicyavā*, *madhyamā*, *pañcamī*, *gāndhārapañcamī*, *āndhrī*, *nandayantī*, *karmāravī* and *kaiśikī*.¹⁰ Bharata also mentions the appropriate *jāti*s for various *rasas*.¹¹ These *jāti*s have also their utility in *dhruvā* songs.¹²

Bharata gives elaborate rules for the placement of various instrumentalists and vocalists in the musical ensemble, described as *kutapa*, in the 28th chapter of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. Of all three ensembles are described, viz., those of stringed instruments, percussion instruments and those related to general application during the dramatic performance. In the former, the vocalist, his wife and the players of *vīṇā*, *vīṇā* and *vaṃśa* are to participate. In the percussion ensemble, it is the players of *mṛdaṅga*, *pāṇava* and *dardara* who are grouped. The orchestra representing all types of characters figure in the ensemble related to dramatic performance proper.¹³ Dr. Raghavan points out that the music ensemble could be small, medium, or large, ranging from five singers, two flutes, and three drums to twelve male and twelve female voices, twenty-six flutes and nine drums.¹⁴

Among the musical instruments, some occupied principal place and others and subordinate position. These are referred to as *aṅga-vādyas* and *pratyāṅga-vādyas* by Bharata. In the case of stringed instruments, *vīṇā* and *citra* were *aṅga-vādyas* while *kacchapī* and *ghoṣaka* were *pratyāṅgas*. In percussion instruments, *mṛdaṅga*, *dardara* and *pāṇava* were *aṅgas* whereas *jhallarī* and *paṭaha* were *pratyāṅgas*. In wind instruments, *vaṃśa* was the *aṅga-vādyā* while *śaṅkha* and *tundikī* occupied the role of *pratyāṅga-vādyas*.

Coming to the actual music played in the production of a play, we can see that the preliminary items were richly embellished by music and orchestration. This was probably done to set the emotional atmosphere of the play. The *pūrvavaṅga* consisted of several items performed behind the curtain and also after the curtain was raised. Singers, drummers and instrumentalists of the stringed varieties participated in these musical items also accompanied by dance movements. We can see this musical tradition even now surviving in regional art forms like Kathakali.

In the performance proper, we come across actual songs called *dhruvā gānas* to be sung on specific occasions. These consisted of entrance songs (*prāveśikī*), exit songs (*naiṣkrāmikī*), reinforcing songs (*prāsādikī*), transitional (*ākṣepikī*) as well as 'filler' songs (*āntarā*). These *dhruvā* songs were composed in Śaurasenī, and occasionally in Māgadhi, even though Sanskrit is also prescribed in

the case of heavenly beings. The slow tempo was to be used to indicate fatigue, lamentation, depression, and fast tempo to depict calamities, anger, etc. Bharata refers to the notes of the two grāmas to be used in the *dhruvā* songs, even though the *jātis* are not mentioned. *Dhruvā* songs depending on the context and made to express the *rasa* suited to the occasion are compared to the stars which brighten the sky.¹⁵

An important point to be noted is that the verses in Sanskrit drama were not meant to be sung, but recited with proper intonation. Of late, there has been a tendency among theatricians to set verses to *rāga* and *tāla* in accordance with their mood, but there is no textual sanction for this in the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. Kale points out: 'Metrical rhythm and tempo and not melodic rhythm and tempo are to be observed in the recitation of Sanskrit verses. This factor is noteworthy because in the post-independence revival of Sanskrit drama in modern India, the actors sing the verses in the melodic patterns of musical *rāgas*. The erroneous nature of this practice is made clear by the rules of oral interpretation laid down by Bharata.'¹⁶

The musical instruments acted as some sort of accompaniments when actions like gathering of flowers, watering of plants, etc., were enacted on the stage. To date this practice survives in art forms like Kathakali and Kūṭiyāttam even though it is the percussion instruments alone which are used in them. Bharata gives elaborate instructions for drummers to symbolically represent walking, movements of birds, death, killing, etc. Bharata suggests that all the instruments are to be played in the performance of festivities, regal processions, campaigns, marriage celebrations, birth of princes, etc.¹⁷ Instruments help to blend the different *aṅgas* and for covering up gaps and minor defects and also for providing leisure of intervals and for general grandeur.

It is very difficult to reconstruct the exact musical practice reflected in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* as the traditional theatre has become extinct now. The music in regional art forms represent later traditions where it is either in a completely degenerated or modified form. We may have to conceive of a reconstruction of the classical theatre using the *rāga* music of later times, since *jāti* music of

Bharata has now been completely superseded. But the *Nāṭyaśāstra* provides ample material for further research in the reconstruction of traditional music as employed in the theatre.

REFERENCES

1. *Nāṭyaśāstra* [= NS], 32.378, Chowkhamba edn., Varanasi, 1980.
See also V. Raghavan, *Sanskrit Drama in Performance*, (Ed.)
Baumer and Brenden, p. 39, Hawaii, 1981.
2. *ibid.* 28.7.
3. *ibid.* 32.425.
4. B.C. Deva, *Musical Instruments*, Introduction, p. 6, Delhi,
1977.
5. NS. 28.27-28.
6. A.L. Basham, *A Cultural History of India* - 'Music', p. 218,
Delhi, 1988.
7. *ibid.*
8. See also Jairazbhoy, *op.cit.*
9. NS. 28.40-41.
10. NS.28.42-43.
11. NS. 29.1-16.
12. *ibid.* 29.5.
13. *ibid.* 28.3-7.
14. *op.cit.* p. 38.
15. NS. 32.481-90.
16. *The Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharata*, p. 190.
17. NS. 33.18-22.

K.V. RAGHAVACHARYA

PAṆDITARĀJA JAGANNĀTHA'S CONCEPT OF ALAṂKĀRA

O.O The *Rasagaṅgādhara* is a classic in Sanskrit poetics by virtue of its originality and insight. Jagannātha assigned proper status to *alaṁkāra* in a *kāvya* which lost its place as a sequel to the emergence of the Dhvani-cum-Rasa Theory.

1.1 The word *alaṁkāra* anticipates the existence of an *alaṁkārya* without which the *alaṁkāra* loses its significance. According to Bharata, *kāvya* is the *alaṁkārya*. In his opinion *alaṁkāras* are the embellishments of poetry (*kāvyaśyaite hy alaṁkārah*, NS. 17.42). This ultimately led to the concept that *alaṁkāra* is 'beauty' in poetry.

1.2 According to Bhāmaha *alaṁkāra* makes poetry charming. Even a fair complexioned lady does not look so charming without *alaṁkāras* which also is the case with poetry. At the root of this beautifying element, *alaṁkāra*, Bhāmaha maintains that there lies *atiśayokti* or *vakrokti* invariably. Without this element there is no strikingness and consequently no *alaṁkāra* will evolve.

1.3 Daṇḍin defines *alaṁkāra* as the property which beautifies poetry (*kāvyaśobhākarān dharmān alaṁkāraṇ pracaṁkṣyate*, KD. 2.1). According to Daṇḍin *alaṁkāra* is an instrument of embellishment going to augment the charm of poetry.

1.4 Vāmana defines *alamkāra* as 'beauty' (*saundaryam alamkāraḥ*, KLS. 1.1.2). He uses the term *alamkāra* in a broad sense to mean poetic beauty and in the specific sense to mean figure of speech. According to Vāmana poetic beauty can be acquired by the introduction of *guṇas*, and *alamkāras* only enhance this poetic beauty (*kavyaśobhāyāḥ kartāro guṇāḥ, tadatīsayahetavas tv alamkāraḥ*, KLS. 1.1.3). Thus Vāmana makes a clear distinction between the concepts of *guṇa* and *alamkāra*. Vāmana maintains that *guṇas* are essential qualities of poetry while *alamkāras* in their restricted sense, are non-essential requirements. *Guṇas* reside in poetry in *samavāya* relation and *alamkāras* in *saṃyoga* relation. Vāmana is of the opinion that *alamkāra* is an external embellishment of poetry.

1.5 The concept of *alamkāra* and its status in poetry has undergone considerable change in the hands of Ānandavardhana. In his opinion, *alamkāras* are related to *rasadhvani*, the *alamkārya*. They adorn the body of poetry (words and meaning) directly and through it, they embellish the poetic soul (*rasadhvani*) in an indirect way. True poetic figures are born spontaneously from poetic intuition and they go to intensify the realisation of *rasa*. Ānandavardhana is the first *ālamkārika* to proclaim that *alamkāra* has no distinct status in poetry as it depends for its genesis and subsistence on *rasa*. But he maintains that, when *alamkāras* are *rasakṣipta*, *apṛthagyatna-nirvartya* and *suśliṣṭa* they attain greater beauty and partake in the nature of the soul (Dhv. 2-28).

1.6 Kuntaka is of opinion that it is *vakratva* which turns a mode of expression into *alamkāra*. As a principle it underlies all the *alamkāras* which are nothing but different aspects of *vakrokti*. Thus he identifies *vakrokti* with *alamkāṛti*, the generic term of *alamkāra*. Kuntaka's treatment of *alamkāra* opens a new chapter by discussing the exact status of the *alamkāra* vis-à-vis the *rasa* in poetry.

2.1 Jagannātha, the last towering personality in the field of poetics, tries to harmonise the theories of the ancients with the new currents of thought of the authority of *anubhava* (experience) and *sampradāya* (established usage). In Viśveśvara's *Camatkāracandrikā* we have a glimpse of the role of *camatkāra* in

poetry. The credit of carrying this concept of *camatkāra* to its fuller extent and evolving a theory centered round the altar of Beauty goes to the profound artistic sense of Jagannātha. It is also significant that in his definition of the *alaṃkāras*, he has made it a point often to emphasize through actual expression, this feature of *sundara* and *ramaṇīya*.

2.2 He defines *alaṃkāra* as the source of *ramaṇīyatā* (charm) of a *kāvya* which has *vyaṅgya* (implied sense) as its soul (काव्यात्मनो व्यङ्ग्यस्य रमणीयता प्रयोजका अलंकारः).¹ The *ramaṇīyatā* is interpreted by Jagannātha as follows :

रमणीयता च लोकोत्तराह्लादजनकज्ञानगोचरता।²

That is *ramaṇīyatā* which rouses unworldly and disinterested pleasure in the mind of a *sahṛdaya*. Jagannātha defines poetry as a linguistic expression which suggests a *ramaṇīyārtha* (रमणीयार्थप्रतिपादकशब्दः काव्यम्).³ Thus he harmonises the concept of *alaṃkāra* with his own concept of poetry.

2.3 Jagannātha declares in unequivocal terms that it is *ramaṇīyatā* or *camatkāratva* which constitutes the very essence of poetic creation. His analysis of the concept of *ramaṇīyatā* reveals the fact that he comprehends all the elements recognised by ancients, e.g. *rasa*, *dhvani*, *guṇa*, *alaṃkāra*, etc., under the wide scope of this concept. In addition to the terms *vicchitti*, *vaicitrya*, *cārutva*, *camatkāra* already used by previous theorists we find Jagannātha using the expressions *hṛdyatva*, *saundarya* and *ramaṇīyatā* almost synonymously.

3.1 Jagannātha states that *vyaṅgya* whether it is *rasa* or *alaṃkāra* or *vastu* is the *alaṃkārya* of *alaṃkāras*. Even *vācya* can be an *alaṃkārya* according to Jagannātha. He classifies *upamālaṃkāra* into five varieties as the *upaskāraka* of *rasa*, *vyaṅgyālaṃkāra*, *vācyaālaṃkāra*, *vyaṅgya-vastu* and *vācya-vastu*.

3.2 Jagannātha says that *alaṃkāra* also can be *alaṃkārya* on two occasions: Firstly, when it is being suggested like *rasādi*, and secondly, even when it is expressed it is *pradhāna* in the absence of *rasādi*. Here he gives a fine example. An ear-ring displayed in a jeweller's show-case being itself *pradhāna*, it is to be decorated

by gems, etc., while both of them will be the *alaṃkāras* when worn by a woman. Similarly *upamā*, etc., may be the *alaṃkārya* of another *alaṃkāra*, but both of them will be the *alaṃkāras* of *rasādi*. Thus Jagannātha accepts that an *alaṃkāra* can have its existence eventhough it does not actually embellish any thing. But its *alaṃkaratva* is only *aupacārika*.

3.3 *Alaṃkāra* which is mainly suggested cannot be called as *alaṃkāra* because itself being *pradhāna* and it does not embellish anything else. But even this is called *alaṃkāra* by general usage. And this is justified by old *Ālaṃkārikas* by applying the *brāhmaṇaśramaṇa-nyāya*. Jagannātha clearly states that there is nothing wrong in accepting *upamā* as *alaṃkāra* when it is being suggested because there is no *virodha* between *vyaṅgyatva* and *alaṃkāratva*. He maintains that such *pradhāna-vyaṅgyopamā* also is called *alaṃkāra* just like an ornament in the Jeweller's showcase which was never used as *alaṃkāra* but still called *alaṃkāra*. Jagannātha's sense of discrimination lies in selecting the analogy of *mañjūṣādigaṭālaṃkāra* in preference to the *brāhmaṇaśramaṇa-nyāya*.

4.1 Jagannātha takes *ramaṇīyatā* as the criterion for a *kāvya* and consequently divides *kāvya* according to the degree thereof. He classifies poetry into four classes. They are *uttamottama*, *uttama*, *madhyama* and *adhama* *kāvyas* where this *ramaṇīyatā* is realised through principal suggestion, secondary suggestion, explicit sense adorned by suggestion and explicit word respectively. In this classification the second and their classes which correspond to the second class (*madhyama-kāvya*) of Dhvani school cover all types of *alaṃkāra-pradhāna-kāvyas*. The second class (*uttama-kāvya*) has distinctly perceptible veneer of suggestion. Hence it is aptly termed *jāgarūkaḡuṇībhūta-vyaṅgya*. It is exemplified in *kāvyas* containing *alaṃkāras* like *saṃśokti*, *paryāyokta* and *aprastuta-praśamsā*. The third class (*madhyama-kāvya*) is called *ajāgarukagūṇībhūta-vyaṅgya*. It is exemplified in *kāvyas* where *alaṃkāras* like *dīpaka*, *prativastūpamā* and *tulyayogitā* appear.

4.2 Jagannātha believes that *alaṃkāra* particularly *arthālaṃkāras*, pertain to *kāvya* in their own right and directly contribute to *rasa* do often reinforce the suggestive function for *uttamottama*-

kāvya. His distinct appreciation of *arthālaṃkāras* as a class aesthetically apart from *śabdālaṃkāras* is credible. This novel approach represents Jagannātha's real contribution to the Śāstra, which, from hoary antiquity is associated with *alaṃkāras* and has given the name to it.

5.1 The following are the statements and explanations about the nature of *alaṃkāra* given by Jagannātha:

1. अलंकारा हि वाच्यसौन्दर्यसाराः प्रायशः स्वान्तर्गतं प्रतीयमानं पृष्ठतः कुर्वन्ति।⁴
2. सुन्दरत्वे सति उपस्कारकत्वम् अलंकारसामान्यलक्षणम् इहापि न विस्मरणीयम्।⁵
3. हृद्यत्वं च अलंकारसामान्यलक्षणगतं सकलालंकारसाधारणमेव इति असकृदुक्तम्।⁶
4. चमत्कारित्वं च अलंकारसामान्यलक्षणप्राप्तमेव।⁷
5. अलंकाराणां भणितिविशेषमात्ररूपत्वात्।⁸
6. विच्छित्तिवैलक्षण्यस्यैवालंकारविभागहेतुत्वात्।⁹
7. विच्छित्तिविशेषोऽलंकारभेदकम्।¹⁰
8. अयमेव चांशोऽत्र कविप्रतिभानिर्मितत्वादलंकारता बीजम्।¹¹
9. वस्तुवृत्तस्य लोकसिद्धत्वे नालंकारत्वायोगात्। यतो बहिरसन्तः कविप्रतिभामात्रकल्पिता अर्थाः काव्ये अलंकारपदास्पदम्।¹²
10. अस्य च कविप्रतिभोल्लसितत्वेन चमत्कारित्वे काव्यालंकारता।¹³

5.2 Jagannātha takes *alaṃkāra* as essence of explicit beauty and a peculiar mode of expression depending on genius of the poet. The special charm (*vicchitti*) peculiar to each composition, which rests on the genius of the poet (*kavi-pratibhā*) makes up the *alaṃkāra* as such, and gives to its distinguishing characteristic. The elements of a poetic figure are *vicchiti-viśeṣa* and *kavi-pratibhā-nirvartitātva*. In other words Jagannātha maintains that a mode of expression becomes *alaṃkāra* if the genius of a poet lends a peculiar charm to it.

5.3 The above statements of Jagannātha make it clear that the *vicchitti-viśeṣa* due to *kavi-pratibhā* is taken throughout as the criterion of *alaṃkāra*. We may also note that this *vicchitti* is more over recognised as the most important differentia in the classification of the *alaṃkāras*.

5.4 According to Jagannātha two characteristics are necessary to constitute *alaṃkāra*, viz. (1) a special charm or strikingness which is variously denoted by the terms *vicchitti*, *ramaṇīyatā*, *ca-matkāra*, *saundarya* or *hr̥dyatva*, and (2) *kavi-pratibhā*. He adds that it must be an embellishment (*upaskāraka*) to a principal idea.

5.5 Jagannātha defines *vicchitti* as: अलंकाराणां परस्परविच्छेदस्य वैलक्षण्यस्य हेतुभूता जन्यता संसर्गेण काव्यनिष्ठा कविप्रतिभा। तज्जन्यत्वप्रयुक्ता चमत्कारिता वा विच्छित्तिः।¹⁴ *vic-chitti* is, in his opinion, the poetic imagination with reference to its power of poetic production or rather, it is the charm which is thereby brought into being and thus forms the basis upon which the poetic figures distinguish themselves in their special peculiarities. Jagannātha shines here as the doyen of critics who first blazed the trail of practical literary analysis and critical judgement.

6.1 Jagannātha asserts that *pratibhā* alone is the source of poetry and as such it fixes the nature of *alaṃkāra*. According to him *alaṃkāra* not only beautifies the body of poetry but directly contributes to aesthetic pleasure.

6.2 Thus the role of the *alaṃkāra* as co-existing (*samānādhi-karaṇa*) with *dhvani* may even vying with it is envisaged by Jagannātha. In the *Rasagaṅgādhara* he uplifts the rank of *guṇībhūta-vyaṅgya* from *madhyama-kāvya* to *uttama-kāvya* which imparted the right place to *alaṃkāra*. Finally, Jagannātha declares that *alaṃkāra* is the "alter-ego" of *dhvani*.

REFERENCES.

1. *Rasagaṅgādhara*, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1939, p. 203.
2. *ibid.* p.4.
3. *ibid.*
4. *ibid.* p. 171.
5. *ibid.* p. 420.
6. *ibid.* p. 480.

7. *ibid.* p. 566.
8. *ibid.* p. 592.
9. *ibid.* p. 435.
10. *ibid.* p. 618.
11. *ibid.* p. 596.
12. *ibid.* p. 602.
13. *ibid.* p. 639.
14. *ibid.* p. 627.

MEGHADUTA : REINTERPRETED

The popularity of the *Meghadūta* is matched by the ambiguity that sticks to a host of its phrases and clauses with respect to their precise connotation and significance in the text, sustained efforts to resolve them by a galaxy of brilliant scholiasts notwithstanding. To be sure, the ambiguity does not stem from their complex or pedantic formation, but from their disarming suggestiveness that renders them liable to more than one interpretation. With even the competent commentators occasionally offering diverse and contradictory renderings, the confusion is made more confounded. As men of culture and sound equipment, they did their best to unravel the tricky text, but the language of the 'cloud messenger' is so pregnant and vibrant that not unoften they too failed to divine the intended sense and relevance of a variety of its expressions. It is doubtless amusing that with as many as sixtyfour commentators and gloss. Writers grappling with the text, over the years, a number of phrases of the poem continue to be as enigmatic as ever. A threadbare appraisal of their true sense and significance has been a desideratum. This is what is sought to be attempted here.

The first word of the poem *kaścī* itself has sparked of a lively controversy about its possible import. The respective commentators have put different meanings on the term which no doubt reflect their equipment but hardly lead us nearer the truth. Some of them have sought to invest the innocuous word with philosophical

overtones. To the flamboyant Pūrṇasārsvatī, it symbolises the unity of the Brahman and *jīva*, and thereby serves the purpose of the benediction to the poem, which is otherwise conspicuous by its absence. *Kaḥ* in his view, stands for the supreme being, while *cit* denotes the individual soul. Sanātana, on the other hand, opines that the mere utterance of *kaḥ* is auspicious implying thereby that it tantamounts to a benediction. Some others tend to treat it as echoing the second word of the impatient inquiry – *asti kaścit vāgviśeṣaḥ* – that Vidyottamā is said to have made about his newly acquired equipment, as Kālidāsa returned to her after undergoing repudiation for a period.

Bharatamallika goes to the extent of involving śāstric sanction to account for the omission of yakṣa's name. Those suffering curse, besides many others, are not to be mentioned by name, so lays down the canon.¹ The poet, instead of mentioning the yakṣa by name, has, therefore, used the non-committal adjective *kaścit* for him.

While these literary exercises deserve esteem, they are patently misplaced. The fact is that there was absolutely no need to mention the yakṣa by name. He is intended to symbolise the eternal lover undergoing the agony of separation from his spouse. Any attempt to relate it to a particular individual would have grievously abridged the universal appeal the poem has deservedly commanded, over the ages. Kālidāsa has wisely left the yakṣa un-named and has thereby widened the horizons of the poem, almost infinitely, to encompass any separated soul in its ambit which finds reflected in the *Meghadūta* the pangs of its own heart. The word *kaścit* serves the purpose excellently well. For all purposes it appears to have been used in the sense of *varīkaḥ*. The yakṣa was indeed 'poor' in the situation to which he was unkindly condemned.

The word *kāntā* closely following *kaścit* is also invested with significance that is both tender and harsh. Its replacement by *bhāryā* or *patnī*, it is to be noted, would not infringe upon the metre, though the verse would suffer grievously in poetic beauty. Derived from $\sqrt{\text{kam}}$, the word is an unmistakable pointer to the fact that the yakṣī was not a mere wife to the yakṣa to be fed as a matter of routine. She was a woman whom he loved so

intensely. As she was his *kāntā* (sweet heart), the separation from her, when it came, turned out to be extremely bitter, unbearable (*guru*). The word thus underscores the rationale of the succeeding phrase *virahaguruṇā*, besides unfolding its charming implication in preference to other synonyms.

Varṣabhogyena, an adjective to *śāpena*, though transparent in its meaning, is also embroiled in a controversy caused by a far-fetched, though ingenious, interpretation of the phrase. According to *Bharatamallika*, the first member (*varṣa*) of the compound stands for *Bhāratavarṣa*. The phrase therefore means *varṣe bhāratavarṣe bhogyam tena*² (to be undergone in India). He is unequivocal in the belief that the compound when so interpreted, is sure to highlight the intensity of yakṣa's suffering because the stay of gods (and demigods) among the mortals is as frightful as a stay in the hell.³ It is a fanciful interpretation of a simple phrase that hardly admits of any ambiguity. It means to underscore the duration of the curse that the yakṣa was to suffer as a punishment for the dereliction of his duty.

The line अन्तर्बाष्पश्चिरमनुचरे रज्जस्य दृष्यौ (3)⁴ has two phrases that call for a searching scrutiny. So far as *antarbāṣpaḥ* is concerned, it is to be remembered that *bāṣpa* represents an earlier stage of *āśru*, caused by joy, malice or sorrow.⁵ The *bāṣpas* are thus tears held back with quite some effort. It is the choking that one experiences before bursting into tears. While the *bāṣpas* are covert (*antar*), the phrase *antarbāṣpaḥ* suggests that though all but ready to break into tears under the stress of separation, the yakṣa was able to control the outburst with his inherent fortitude. As a sober person, it ill behove him to cry like a lesser mortal. Thus the implication of the phrase is that despite intense agony the yakṣa was able to control and conduct himself with a measure of poise. धीरोदात्तत्वादन्तःस्थमित्याहुः सन् as Mallinātha puts it. In Kalyāṇa's view the control of tears by the yakṣa is indicative of the impending union with his spouse.⁶ It is a curious interpretation. It rather strikes at the root of the rationale of sending the cloud to her.

The perfect form *dadhyau* has also evoked diverse interpretations. *Sthiradeva* and *Cāritravardhana* are unanimous in the belief that the verb reflects the yakṣa's indecisiveness whether or not

should he reveal his mind to the cloud. It runs counter the present frame of the yakṣa's mind. That he had lost the discernment to decide the suitability of the cloud as a worthy messenger is amply suggested by कामार्तं हि प्रकृतिकृष्णाश्चेतनाचेतनेषु ! He was there to bare his heart to the cloud. And he could have hardly doubted the cloud's credentials to carry his message.

The omission of the object of the verb, on the other hand, has led the commentators to hazard guesses according to their lights. Cāritravardhana inducts *dayitām* and Kṛṣṇapati *alakām* as its object. Both of them seem to have overshot the mark because his beloved and her abode Alakā were always close to his heart. As a matter of fact there is no need to conjure up a *karman* here. The yakṣa was so confused and deluded because of the agony that he could have hardly thought of any object in the situation.⁷

The poet does not mean to emphasise here what the yakṣa thought of at the sight of the cloud. It is his misery compounded with ardent yearnings that is sought to be highlighted. Mallinātha prefers to connect *ciram* with the verb and opines that the yakṣa reflected for long till the upsurge of his emotions, stirred by the sight of the cloud, abated and a modicum of normalcy returned to him: दध्यौ चिन्तयामास। मनोविकारोपशमनपर्यन्तमिति शेषः।

With the commentators sharply divided over its interpretation, the compound *śāśābandhaḥ* occurring in:

आशाबन्धः कुसुमसदृशं प्रायशो ह्यङ्गनानां

सद्यः पाति प्रणयिहृदयं विप्रयोगे रुणद्धि॥ (10)

calls for serious consideration. The true connotation of the hemistich hinges on whether the phrase is intended to serve as a *śleṣopamā* or not. A band of commentators, Mallinātha included, is emphatic that no *śleṣopamā* is meant here. They therefore favour the apparent interpretation. "The bond of hope sustains in separation the loving heart of the women (which is tender) like flower, and thus prone to break down soon."

However, the earlier commentators like, Sthiradeva and Vellabha are inclined to discern a veiled *śleṣa* here. The compound, they feel, is not bald enough to mean 'knot of hope' only, it addedly

stands for the network of tissues.⁸ The view is upheld by the phrase *kusumasadr̥śam*, used as one of the adjectives to *hṛdayam*. The obvious connotation is that as a flower tossed by air is held by the network of tissues, so is the tender heart of the women folk, tormented by pangs of separation, is sustained by the hope of further union. It is certainly an idea worthy of Kālidāsa. The use of *kusumabandhaḥ* with *āsābandhaḥ* reveals it beyond cavil that both the senses of the phrase were intended to be conveyed here.

येन श्यामं वपुरतितरां कान्तिमापत्स्यते ते
बर्हेणेव स्फुरितरुचिना गोपवेषस्य दिष्णोः॥

This later half of verse Fifteen is marked by a beautiful simile, with the second line serving an *upamāna*. Most of the commentators have smugly interpreted the text without bestowing thought on the relevance of the standard of comparison. It was Bharatamallika who first turned focus on the significance of *gopaveśasya viṣṇoḥ*. While Viṣṇu, in his view, serves to emphasise the omnipresence of the Lord, *gopaveśasya* underscores his competence to assume at will the form of his choosing. The *upamāna* thus implies that the cloud was invested with both the traits. It spreads everywhere and assumes a plethora of forms like Viṣṇu himself.⁹ He is indeed *kāmarūpa*.

The significance of the phrase अमरमिथुनप्रेक्षणीयामवस्थाम् in verse 18 is far from clear. "With the dark cloud perched on its peak and its environs covered with the mango trees bent with ripe fruits, the mount Āmrakūṭa would appear as if it were a breast of the earth." The beauty of the breast-like hillock invited the attention of the divine couples. And herein lies the difficulty. While it was natural for the male deities to feast their eyes on this 'breast', why should their womenfolk turn their gaze to it? They simply could not have any curiosity about it. The word *mithuna*, opines Mallinātha, has been used in the text to emphasise the fact that the lovers alone can visualise a mount as a breast. According to him the implication of the clause is that as a lover, overcome with fatigue, sleeps on the breasts of his spouse, so should the cloud relieve himself of tiredness by having restful sleep on the breast of the lady earth.¹⁰ While appreciable, the gloss seems to have missed the true import of the clause, Bharatamallika hits the mark when he says that though the divine couples, engaged in love-sports, should have no

use for anything else at the moment, if the 'breast' of the earth still attracted their attention, it only reveals its exceptional charms. Alternatively, it may be presumed that the divine ladies were struck with wonder to find only one 'breast' of the earth. That all the more stirred their curiosity to see it intently.¹¹

कुर्वन्सन्ध्याबलिपटहतां शूलिनः श्लाघनीयम् (34) is liable to one interpretation only. The cloud is asked here to act as a tabor in the evening prayer of Lord Śiva at the Mahākāla shrine. He could have done so by letting out low (*āmandra*) thunderings. This is more than hinted in the subsequent line wherein it is assured of ample reward for his devoted performance. All this is inherent in the primary sense of *paṭahatām kurvan*. But the fact that the cloud plays the tabor only with his rumblings, has led some of the commentators to take the phrase in its derivative sense on the ground of the supposed identity of cause and effect (*kāraṇakāryor abhedopacārāt*). *Paṭaha*, in their view, has been used here to denote *paṭahadhvani*, sound resembling that of a tabor:

रत्नच्छायाखचितवलिभिश्चामरैः क्लान्तहस्ताः (35) is one of the clauses that qualify the courtesans, serving at the shrine. The phrase रत्नच्छायाखचितवलिभिः, an adjective to *cāmaraiḥ*, is caught in a rather unhappy controversy. With the commentators giving varied interpretations of *vali*, the word has come to hold key to the possibly correct connotation of the clause. Some of the celebrated commentators including Mallinātha take *vali* to denote 'a handle' (*daṇḍa*) here. "The hands of the courtesans were tired of waving at the Lord the chouries whose handles were tinged with the lustre of the gems (of their bangles)," is how they mean to interpret the line. While no offence can be taken against the rendering, one has to strain oneself to believe that the effulgence of the gems pervaded the handles of the chouries so prominently as to draw pointed attention of the poet. It was perhaps to obviate this anomaly that some of the scholiasts prefer to interpret the phrase as follows: 'the handles of the chouries were studded (*khacita*) with the gems'. While in doing so they might have straightened the sense, they have lost sight of the word *chāyā* which seems to them to have no *locus standi* in the phrase.

Vallabha has made the breath-taking suggestion that *vali* here denotes *udararekhā*, implying thereby that the *udaravalis* of the

courtesans were brought into view by the lustre of the gems. One wonders how the *ratnacchāyā* could have been instrumental in revealing the *udaravalis* which should have been visible to the naked eye of its own. If, as averred by Vallabha, the *udara-rekhās* were covered with the garments of the courtesans,¹² the possibility of their coming into view, even with the gentle lustre of the gems, recedes further.

While none of the three interpretations can be claimed to be unblemished, one may broadly concur with Mallinātha.

The yakṣa advises the cloud to be solicitous to the *abhisārikās* and not to frighten them with noises: तोयोत्सर्गस्तनितमुखरो मा स्म भूर्विक्लवास्ताः (37). The validity of the compound *toyotsargastanitamukharah* should rest on whether the shedding of rain is accompanied by thunder or not. While the phenomena may occur simultaneously, the cloud does not invariably thunder as it rains. The fact makes the interpretation of Cāritravardhana (जलत्यागेन यत् स्तनितं तेन मुखरः शब्दायमानस्त्वम्¹³) and others (तोयोत्सर्गे जलत्यागे यत् स्तनितं गर्जितं तेन मुखरः¹⁴) rather suspect. Neither the rain is always accompanied by the rumblings of the cloud nor it itself causes noise harsh enough to scare away the *abhisārikās*, howsoever timid (*viklavāḥ*) they might have been. Alive of the phenomena, Mallinātha prefers to take it as a *dvandva* compound: तोयोत्सर्गस्तनितार्थ्यां वृष्टिगर्जितार्थ्यां मुखरः शब्दायमानो मा स्म भूः। He disfavours the way the earlier commentators had dissolved the compound: नञ् तोयोत्सर्गे स्तनितमिति विग्रहः। Though even as a *dvandva* compound it presupposes that the twin acts of raining and thundering occur side by side, the implication is that the cloud should desist from both raining and thundering as the *abhisārikās* proceed to meet their lovers at night. वृष्टिगर्जिते न कार्ये, as Mallinātha aptly puts it.

While describing Gambhīrā the yakṣa confides into the cloud that his *chāyātmā* too would gain entry into its clear water: छायात्मापि प्रकृतिसुभगो लप्स्यते ते प्रवेशम् (40). The import of *chāyātmā* is not beyond dispute. Mallinātha dissolves it as *chāyā cāsau ātmā* (body in the form of reflection). *Apī*, according to him, suggests his unwillingness to enter the *nadī-nāyikā*. To him *chāyātmā* thus implies that though himself reluctant to enter it, the body of the cloud in the form of its shadow would surely gain entry into the placid water of the river. The rider प्रवेशमनिच्छेदपि seems to rob the interpretation

of its precision. With the river behaving like a mature *nāyikā*, it is difficult to understand why the cloud, represented as a *nāyaka*, should hesitate in proceeding to meet his lady-love.

Sthiradeva, on the other hand, paraphrases *chāyātmā* as *pratibimbavarūpam* and takes *apī* in the sense of *sambhāvanā*. The phrase thus implies that not to speak of your actual body, even its reflection will find entry into the clear waters of the river.¹⁵

In describing the fascination of the heavenly nymphs for the cloud in the situation, Kālidāsa remarks: ताभ्यो मोक्षस्तव यदि सखे घर्मलब्धस्य न स्वात् (61). Here the word *gharmalabdhasya* poses difficulty. It obviously qualifies *tava* and means 'the cloud who had reached the Kailāsa in the summer'. In view of the fact that the cloud was commissioned to carry the message in the rainy season, it sounds odd to talk of summer soon thereafter. Mallinātha seeks to surmount the difficulty on the plea that the divine land, unlike that of the mortals, is characterised by the presence of all the seasons round the year. Therefore no contradiction is involved in referring to the cloud as *gharmalabdha*. It should also be remembered that the rains having set in recently could be as oppressive as the hot season.¹⁶ Pūrṇasarasvatī, on the other hand, seeks to take *gharma* in the sense of love-fever on the specious ground that the sun could not have oppressed the divine damsels, given as they were to uninterrupted pleasures.¹⁷

Of the many ways in which the cloud could enjoy himself on the Kailāsa, one was कुर्वन् कामं क्षणमुखपटप्रीतिमैरवतस्य (62). What does क्षणमुखपटप्रीतिम् denote here! While there is no doubt about it, Mallinātha's rendering क्षणे जलादानकाले मुखे पटेन प्रीतिस्तां कुर्वन् adds an element of confusion to its intended sense. How while taking water from the Mānasa lake, could the cloud cause the pleasure of face-cover to the divine elephant, passes comprehension. The cloud could have afforded pleasure only by spreading itself on Airāvata's face. As the cloud had descended on the waters of the lake, he could not spread himself at the same time on the face of the elephant as well. Obviously Mallinātha's interpretation of *kṣaṇa* is not tenable. The word seems to have been used in the sense of *atyanta-samyoga*. And this is how some of the commentators prefer to treat it: क्षणं मुहूर्तं मुखपटः तेन वा प्रीतिः बुद्धिः तां (कुर्वन्)! कुञ्जरः किल मुखपटेन प्रावार्यन्ते।¹⁸ While concurring with his

predecessor, Bharatamallika provides the additional information that the face and eyes of the elephants when they are tormented by heat, are covered with pieces of wet cloth, a claim contested by Sanātanagosvāmī: न तु हस्तिनः सुखार्थं मुखे आर्द्रवस्त्राणि दीयन्ते। It may or may not have been the practice to provide relief to the elephants by putting wet covers on their faces, what Kālidāsa means to convey is that when the cloud laden with water stretches itself on the divine elephant for a while, it would have the feeling as if a wet cloth had been rolled out on its face to relieve the tedium of heat.

Waxing eloquent on the beauties of the sport-hill in his house at Alakā, the yakṣa nostalgically remarks: प्रेक्ष्योपान्तस्फुरिततडितं त्वां तमेव स्मरामि (74). The cloud bears remarkable resemblance with the pleasure-hill as it is detailed in the verse. While the peak of the *krīḍāsaila* is formed by a mass of emeralds, and it is surrounded by the golden banana trees, the cloud is dark-blue in colour and has the lightening flashing intermittently on its borders. The striking resemblance between the two leads the yakṣa to tell the cloud that on seeing it (the cloud) he was instantly reminded of the pleasure hill. This is the most sensible interpretation of the verse and most of the commentators have rendered it as such. Here *tvām* forms the object of *prekṣya*.

However, misplaced ingenuity has not spared the innocent line. As remarked earlier, the gerundive form is connected with *tvām*. But Bharatamallika is inclined to take प्रेक्ष्योपान्तस्फुरिततडितम् as a well-knit compound, qualifying *tvām*. The construction, though indefensible on all counts, has served to lend a different interpretation to the line: त्वां तमेव स्मरामि चिन्तयामि। कीदृशं त्वाम्। प्रेक्ष्या दर्शनीया उपान्ते समीपे स्फुरिता तडितं विद्युत् यस्य तादृशम्। While the language can certainly be tortured to yield such an absurd meaning, the monstrosity could never have been intended by a sophisticated poet like Kālidāsa. In giving the strained interpretation, Bharatamallika blissfully forgot the simple fact that only an object not present at hand but known earlier, can be the subject of *smṛti*: ज्ञातविषयकं ज्ञानं स्मृतिः। With the *krīḍāsaila* superimposed on the cloud, the yakṣa can hardly claim to remember it, as it was already present there. Therefore the verbal form *smarāmi* loses its relevance here. As aptly remarked by Mallinātha: सदृशवस्त्वनुभवदिदृष्टस्मृतिर्जायते इत्यर्थः। निरुक्तकारस्तु त्वां तमेव स्मरामि इति योजयित्वा मेघे शैलत्वारोपमाच्चे तदसंगतम्।

The yakṣa assures the cloud that he would find his love-lorn spouse, engaged in a variety of activities suited to the predicament to which she is condemned at the moment. His words आलोके ते निपतति पुर बलिव्याकुला वा (82) are so diaphanous in their meaning that they hardly admit any quibbling whatsoever. As enjoined by Pāṇini (vide his sūtra: *yāvatpurānīpātayor laṭ*, III.3.4), the present tense, if used with the particles *yāvat* and *purā*, conveys the sense of future. Therefore, *nīpatati* here stands for *nīpatiṣyati* and the line evidently means that 'she would fall' (come) in your sight, engaged in one chore or the other. This is how most of the commentators, not precluding Mallinātha, seek to interpret it, though he insists to take *purā* in such cases in the sense of 'near future', i.e. 'soon' on Amara's authority who reads: *syāt prabandhe purātīte nikaṭāgāmike purā*.

Dakṣiṇāvartanātha first gives the normal meaning, but subsequently lapses into a semantic jugglery and tortures the language to extort a sense that does not belong to it: त्वां दृष्ट्वा सा भृशं मदिरहाद भूमौ निपतिष्यति यावत्। ... अथवा त्वद् दर्शनात् पुर वक्ष्यमाणान् कुर्वती सा त्वालोकं भूमौ निपतिष्यतीत्यर्थः। This is how he (mis)interprets the verse. Bharatamallika goes a step further and makes the yakṣī fall unconscious at the sight of the cloud: त्वामालोक्य मूर्छिता सती भूमौ गात्रं पातयिष्यतीत्यर्थः।

How these learned commentators have come to such a mortal conclusion, is not easy to understand. Firstly, the verb *nīpatati* cannot be detached from *āloke* on any cogent ground. Secondly, there was no valid reason for the yakṣī to lapse into swoon on merely seeing the cloud. The cloud could rather be expected to give her comfort with its gentle and cool touch. It was certainly not a frightful figure to send the yakṣī into swoon. If anything, the strained interpretation bespeaks the garbled understanding of the text even by these gifted commentators. It should therefore be discarded in favour of the earlier rendering of the text, which alone makes sense here.

The cloud is advised to withhold its rumblings and wait for at least one watch in case the yakṣī was asleep at the time of his arrival in his house: अन्वास्थैनं स्तनितमुखरो याममात्रं सहस्व (94). What precisely is the significance of the word *yāma* in the verse? Why should the cloud wait for one watch, not more or less? The question has

been answered differently by various commentators. According to Mahimabhaṭṭa it is intended to highlight the excellence of the yakṣī as a nāyikā. It reveals that she was the Padminī type of heroine. It is Padminī who is known to sleep at night for one *prahāra* only.

Dakṣiṇāvartanātha, on the other hand, is convinced that the word *yāmamātram* has not been used here to denote what type of heroine the yakṣī was. Nor should it be presumed that otherwise also she slept for one watch of the night only.

Mallinātha is right when he says that the love-sports of the young virile couples last, at a time, for one watch. The yakṣī might be enjoying the sports in the dream which were to continue for equal duration. It would be cruel on the part of the cloud to detract her from the pleasure of dalliance. He has therefore been cautioned not to disturb her for a *yāma* so that she may persist with the exercise in the dream: शक्तयोरेकवारसुरतस्य यामावधिकत्वात्स्वप्नेऽपि तथा भवितव्यमित्यभिप्रायः।

The verse त्वामालिख्य प्रणयकुपितां धातुरगैः न कृतान्तः (102) describes the hopeless situation in which the yakṣa is placed at the moment. The implication of the verse evidently is that the yakṣa had somehow drawn the picture of his spouse on the slab, but as he struggled to draw his own at her feet tears welled up in his eyes. He was frustrated in the attempt and was thus denied union with his darling, even in the lifeless drawing. While the interpretation has the approval of no less an authority than Mallinātha, it is severely contested by Bharatamallika. He is of the view that the gerund form *ālikhya* has no *locus standi* here, because the moment he took to drawing, his vision was impaired, albeit temporarily, by the gushing tears. It would severely strain the imagination to believe that he could draw the figure of his wife in that hopeless situation. There is, however, nothing to warrant such a conclusion, and the commentator seems to admit it. The suffix *-lyap* is a pointer to the hiatus that existed between drawing the yakṣī's form and the tears that welled up to bedim his vision. He had doubtless completed the picture of his wife but as he gazed at it, rather passionately, his pent-up emotions burst out with a vengeance. The torrents of tears made it impossible for him to draw himself at the feet of his spouse's picture. Thus he was robbed of *saṅgama* even in the

drawing. It poignantly reminded him how difficult it was to have it in actual life. Bharatamallika was not unaware of the merit of the interpretation. This is more than evident from his observation: अन्ये तु पूर्वार्द्धे कष्टसृष्टया लिखननिर्वाहो ज्ञापितः किन्तु चरणपतनकाले दृष्टिलोप इत्याहुः। Sthiradeva paraphrases *ātmānam* as *nijākāram* which unmistakably suggests that the *caranapāta* was nothing but the drawing of his figure by the yakṣa close to the feet of the form of his wife, drawn on the slab.

These detailed investigations into the precise import of some of the expressions of the *Meghadūta* reveal it beyond cavil that the supposedly simple phrases of the poem are full of pitfalls. They have to be negotiated with caution and patience.

REFERENCES

1. न नामग्रहणं कुर्यात्कृपणस्य गुरोस्तथा।
अभिशाप्तस्य पत्न्याश्च मात्रापित्रोर्विशेषतः॥
Meghadūta with Sanātana's *Tātparyāṭikā* (ed. Roma Choudhary and J.B. Choudhary, Calcutta), p. 2.
2. *Meghadūta* with Bharatamallika's *Subodhā* (ed. J.B. Choudhary, Calcutta, 1951), p. 1.
3. *ibid.* p. 1.
4. References are to the edition of the *Meghadūta* by S.K. De, Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, 1957.
5. बाष्पो नामाश्रुणः पूर्वावस्थाऽसौ जायते त्रिधा।
निमित्तत्रयसाम्बन्धादानन्देर्ध्यातिसम्भवा। Bharatamallika, *op.cit.* p. 5.
6. अनेनागताम्बूनां स्तम्भनं भाविप्रियासङ्गममङ्गलत्वेन व्यज्यते। *Meghadūta* with Kalyāṇa's commentary (ed. J.B. Choudhary), Introduction, p. 22.
7. मोहादविषयशून्यतया ध्यायते कर्माप्रयोगः। *Meghadūta* with Dakṣiṇāvartanātha's *Pradīpa* (ed. T. Ganapati Sastri), Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, 1919, p.4.
8. आशाबन्ध आशाबन्ध इव। यथा आशाबन्धो जालाकारकृततन्तुनिकरः कुसुममपि शुष्कं वातेरिति रुन्धे।
Meghadūta with Vallabhadeva's *Pañjikā* (ed. E. Hultz), Royal Asiatic Society, 1911, p. 8.
9. विष्णुपदेन सर्वव्यापकत्वं गोपवेष्टस्येत्यनेन स्वेच्छाविग्रहत्वञ्च प्रतिपादितम्। तद् द्वयं यथा तस्य तथा तत्वापीति ध्वनिः। Bharatamallika, *op.cit.*, p. 18.
10. यथा परिश्रान्तः कश्चित् कामी कामिनीनां कुचकलशे विश्रान्तः सन्स्वपिति तदवद प्रवानपि पुवो नायिकायाः स्तन इति ध्वनिः। *Meghadūta* with *Saṅgīvanī* (ed. Sansav Chand, Mohan Dev), Benares, 1951, Part I, p. 55.

11. Bharatamallika, op.cit. p. 20.
12. तासां हि वासोयुगाच्छादितानां चामरमणिमासा मध्यवलयः प्रकटीभवन्ति। Vallabha, op.cit. p. 21.
13. Meghadūta with Cāritravardhana's Cāritravardhini (ed. Brahma Shankar Shastri), Varanasi, 1968, p. 48.
14. Bharatamallika, op.cit. p. 35.
15. साक्षात् त्वदीयरूपं तावदास्ताम्। तत्प्रतिकृतिरपि लप्स्यते प्राप्स्यति प्रवेशम्। Meghadūta with Sthiradeva's Bālaprabodhini (ed. V.G. Pranjape, Poona), p. 51.
16. प्राथमिकमेघत्वाद्वा। Mallinātha, op.cit.
17. Meghadūta with Pūrṇasarasvatī's Vidyullatā, (ed. R.V. Krishnamacariar), Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam, 1926, p. 93.
18. Sthiradeva, op.cit. p. 75.

N.S. RAMANUJA TATACHARYA

ज्ञानस्वरूपम्
विषयता-प्रकारता-विशेष्यता-संसर्गतादिस्वरूपं च

न्यायसूत्रे प्रथमाध्याये “बुद्धिरुपलब्धिर्ज्ञानमित्यनर्थान्तरम्” (न्या.सू. 1.1.15)* इति पर्यायशब्दाः पठिताः। तत्र भाष्ये अचेतनस्य करणस्य बुद्धेर्ज्ञानं वृत्तिः, चेतनस्याकर्तुरुपलब्धिरिति मतनिराकरणपरमिदं सूत्रम्। नाचेतनस्य करणस्य बुद्धेः ज्ञानं भवितुमर्हति, तर्हि तच्चेतनं स्यात्। ज्ञानवत् एव चेतनत्वात् इति प्रत्यपादि। अनेन ज्ञानं न करणरूपबुद्धेः गुणः, अपि तु कर्तुरात्मनो गुण इत्येतावन्मात्रं सिद्ध्यति।

न्यायदर्शन एव तृतीयाध्यायद्वितीयाह्निके बुद्धिपरीक्षाप्रकरणे बुद्धेरनित्यत्व-मात्मगुणत्वं च सयुक्तिकं समर्थितम्। तथाहि —

“कर्माकाशसाधर्म्यात् संशयः” (न्या.सू. 3.2.1) अनित्ये कर्मणि नित्ये आकाशे च योऽस्पर्शत्वाख्यः समानधर्मः स बुद्धावुपलभ्यते। अतो बुद्धिर्नित्या अनित्या वेति संशयः। तत्र सांख्यमतेन नित्यत्वं पूर्वपक्षीकृत्य “ज्ञास्यामि, जानामि, अज्ञासिषम्” इति कालत्रयसंबन्धः उपजनापायावन्तरेणानुपपद्यमानः अनित्यत्वमव-गमयतीति अनित्यत्वमेव बुद्धेः इति सिद्धान्तितम्। ततः—

“नेन्द्रियार्थयोस्तद्विनाशेऽपि ज्ञानावस्थानात्” (न्या.सू. 3.2.19) बुद्धिः नेन्द्रियस्य न वा अर्थस्य गुणः। तन्नाशेऽपि ज्ञानस्य स्मरणस्य अवस्थानात्

* *Nyāyadarśana* with the commentary of Vātsyāyana, ed. Jayanarayana, Bibliotheca Indica, 56, 67, 70, Calcutta 1865.

पटनिष्ठविशेष्यतायाश्च तज्ज्ञानरूपत्वेनाभिन्नतया तज्ज्ञाननिरूपितघटनिष्ठ-
विशेष्यताया इव पटनिष्ठविशेष्यताया अपि घटत्वनिष्ठप्रकारतानिरूपितत्वमाव-
श्यकमिति घटत्वनिष्ठप्रकारतानिरूपित-घटत्वाभाववत् पटनिष्ठविशेष्यता-
शालितया भ्रमलक्षणाक्रान्तत्वात्।

विषयतायाः विषयस्वरूपत्वे विषयभेदेन विषयताभेदस्यावश्यकतया यद्यपि
पूर्वोक्तदोषवारणं संभवति, तथापि घटभूतलसंयोगा इति समूहालम्बनज्ञानस्य
घटवत् भूतलमिति विशिष्टज्ञानस्य च वैलक्षण्यं न निर्वहति। उभयोरपि ज्ञानयोः
घटो भूतलं संयोगश्च विषयाः। तन्निष्ठाश्च विषयताः तत्तत्स्वरूपत्वेनाभिन्नाः
इति।

न च विशिष्टज्ञाने संबन्धस्य संबन्धोऽपि अधिकतया भासते, समूहालम्बने
तु नेति तयोः वैलक्षण्यमिति वाच्यम्। सम्बन्धसम्बन्धमादायापि समूहालम्बन-
सम्भवात्। तथा च घटभूतलसंयोगसमवायाः इति समूहालम्बनस्य घटवत्
भूतलमिति ज्ञानस्य च वैलक्षण्यानुपपत्तिः।

तस्मात् ज्ञानविषयाभ्यामतिरिक्तमेव विषयत्वमिति अनन्यगतिकतया स्वीकर-
णीयम्। तच्च आश्रयतया विषये, निरूपकतया ज्ञाने वर्तते।

एवं विषयित्वमप्यतिरिक्तः पदार्थः। विषयस्वरूपत्वे ज्ञानस्वरूपत्वे च पूर्वोक्त-
दोषाणां प्रसक्तेः। न च विषयतानिरूपकत्वमेव विषयित्वमस्तु, किं तस्यातिरिक्त-
त्वेनेति वाच्यम्। विषयित्वमेवातिरिक्तम्, विषयत्वं तु विषयितानिरूपकत्वमि-
त्यस्यापि सुवचत्वात्। तस्मात् विनिगमनाविरहात् उभयमप्यतिरिक्तम्।

सिद्धान्तलक्षणे दीधितिकारैः — “प्रतियोगित्वादिः स्वरूपसंबन्धविशेषः” इति
स्वयमुक्त्वा, “विषयतातत्त्वादिवत् प्रतियोगित्वाधिकरणत्वतत्त्वसम्बन्धत्वाद-
योऽप्यतिरिक्ता एव पदार्थाः इत्येकदेशिनः” इत्युक्तम्। तत्र व्याख्यायां गदाधरभट्टा-
चार्यैः एवं निरटङ्कि —

प्राचीनैकदेशिभिः विषयताया अतिरिक्तपदार्थत्वोपगमात् दृष्टान्तत्वेन तदु-
पन्यासः। तथा हि विषयतायाः विषयस्वरूपत्वे इदं द्रव्यमित्याकारकात् द्रव्यत्वाव-
च्छिन्नघटविषयकज्ञानात् अयं घट इत्याकारकस्य घटत्वावच्छिन्नघटविषयक-
ज्ञानस्य वैलक्षण्यं न स्यात्। उभयत्रापि घटस्यैव विषयत्वेन घटस्वरूपविषयतायां
वैलक्षण्याभावात्। न च तयोर्ज्ञानयोः द्रव्यत्वघटत्वयोरपि विषयताया तदात्मक-
विषयतावैलक्षण्यात् वैलक्षण्यमिति वाच्यम्। तावतापि द्रव्यत्वेन घटं घटत्वेन

च पटमवगाहमानात् 'इदं द्रव्यं घटश्च' इत्याकारकज्ञानात् घटत्वेन घटं द्रव्यत्वेन पटमवगाहमानस्य तदाकारकज्ञानस्य वैलक्षण्यं न स्यात्। द्रव्यत्वघटत्वयोः घटपटयोश्चोभयत्र ज्ञाने विषयतया द्रव्यत्वाद्यात्मकविषयतायां वैलक्षण्यभावात्। अतो विषयताया विषयस्वरूपत्वं दुर्भणम्। विषयतायाः ज्ञानस्वरूपत्वे 'घटपटौ' इत्यादिसमूहालम्बनज्ञानीयघटपटादिविषयतानां ज्ञानैक्येन एकतापत्त्या यथा तादृशज्ञानीयघटनिष्ठविषयताया घटत्वावच्छिन्नत्वं तथा तदीयपटनिष्ठविषयताया घटत्वावच्छिन्नतया स्वव्यधिकरणप्रकारावच्छिन्नविषयताशालितया तादृशज्ञानस्य भ्रमत्वापत्तिः। तद्वारणाय विषयतायाः ज्ञानविषयोभयस्वरूपत्वाङ्गीकारे जातिमान् घट इत्याकारकज्ञानीयघटत्वविषयतायाः वैलक्षण्यं न स्यात् विषयस्य घटत्वस्य ज्ञानस्य चैक्यात्। तथा च केवलं जातिमान् इत्याकारात् घट इत्याकारकाच्च ज्ञानात् 'जातिमान् घट' इत्याकारकज्ञानस्य वैलक्षण्यं न स्यात्। तस्मात् विषयता अतिरिक्तः पदार्थः। सा च विषयभेदेन भिन्ना। तासामनुगमकतया विषयतात्वे चातिरिक्तम्।

प्रतियोगित्वम्

एवं प्रतियोगित्वमप्यतिरिक्तः पदार्थः। तथाहि — प्रतियोगितायाः प्रतियोगि-स्वरूपत्वे घटादिनिष्ठानां घटत्वद्रव्यत्वादिरूपनानाधर्मावच्छिन्नानां संयोगसम-वायादिरूपनानासंबन्धावच्छिन्नानां च प्रतियोगितानां घटादिस्वरूपत्वेनैक्यापत्त्या अभाववैलक्षण्यानुपपत्तिः।

प्रतियोगितायाः अभावस्वरूपत्वे घटाभावनिरूपितात् घटत्वावच्छिन्नात् प्रति-योगित्वात् पूर्वक्षणवृत्तित्वविशिष्टघटाभावाभावत्वावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगितायाः वैल-क्षण्यं न स्यात्। तदवैलक्षण्ये च घटत्वस्य घटाभावीयप्रतियोगित्व-न्यूनवृत्तितया घटाभावीयप्रतियोगितावच्छेदकत्वानुपपत्तिः।

किं च घटाभावीयप्रतियोगितायाः घटाभावस्वरूपत्वे पटे घटाद्यभावसत्त्वेन घटाभावीयप्रतियोगित्वं स्यात्। अतः प्रतियोगित्वमतिरिक्तपदार्थः।

अधिकरणत्वम्

एवमधिकरणत्वं नाधिकरणस्वरूपम्, न वा आधेयस्वरूपम्। भूतले घटसंयोग-दशायामिव परस्परसंयुक्ततया घटभूतलयोः सत्त्वदशायामपि इदानीं भूतलं घटवदिति प्रतीत्यापत्तिः। अधिकरणत्वस्य संयोगस्वरूपत्वे उक्तदोषवारणसंभ-वेऽपि आधेयत्वस्यापि तुल्ययुक्त्या संयोगस्वरूपतया आधारत्वाधेयत्वयोरभेद-प्रसङ्गेन भूतलं घटवदितिवत् घटो भूतलवान् इत्यपि प्रतीतिप्रसङ्गः। तस्मात् अधिकरणत्वमतिरिक्तः पदार्थः।

एवं सम्बन्धत्वमपि क्लृप्तपदार्थान्तर्भावेण दुर्वचमिति तदप्यतिरिक्तः पदार्थः।
एवमभावत्वमपि अतिरिक्तः पदार्थः।

वस्तुतस्तु अभावत्वं प्रतियोगित्वात् नातिरिच्यते। घटाभावस्य घटनिरूपित-
प्रतियोगित्वात् इत्यादि निरूपितम्।

विषयत्वादिकं तु विषयभेदेन भिद्यते। अन्यथा घटवदभूतलमित्यादिज्ञानीयघट-
भूतलादिविषयतानां घटपटावित्यादिज्ञानीयविषयतानां चाभेदप्रसङ्गेन ज्ञानानां
वैलक्षण्यानुपपत्तेः। न तु ज्ञानभेदेनापि विषयतानां भेदः प्रमाणाभावात्।

प्रकारता - विशेष्यतादिभेदः

विषयत्वं च द्विविधम्, विषयत्वानिरूपितं तन्निरूपितं चेति। तत्र निर्विकल्पक-
ज्ञाननिरूपितविषयता विषयत्वानिरूपिता। निर्विकल्पकज्ञानीयघटत्वादिनिष्ठविष-
यतायां घटादिनिष्ठविषयतानिरूपितत्वे प्रमाणाभावात् विशिष्टबुद्धिविष-
यताश्च विषयत्वान्तरनिरूपिताः। तथाहि घटवदभूतलमिति ज्ञाने घटः संयोगः भूतलं
च विषयाः। घटनिष्ठा प्रकारता भूतलनिष्ठा विशेष्यता संयोगनिष्ठा संसर्गता चेति
तिस्रो विषयताः तासां परस्परं निरूप्यनिरूपकभावः स्वीक्रियते। घटनिष्ठा प्रकारता
भूतलनिष्ठविशेष्यतानिरूपिता, भूतलनिष्ठा विशेष्यता घटनिष्ठप्रकारतानिरूपि-
तेत्येवम्। विशिष्टबुद्धिविषयतानां परस्परं निरूप्यनिरूपकभावानङ्गीकारे घटवद-
भूतलं पर्वतो वह्निमानित्याकारकज्ञानविषयतायाः घटवान् पर्वतो वह्निमदभू-
तलमित्याकारकज्ञानविषयतायाश्च अवैलक्षण्यप्रसङ्गेन तयोर्ज्ञानयोरवैलक्षण्य-
प्रसङ्गात्। परस्परं निरूप्यनिरूपकभावाङ्गीकारे च प्रथमे ज्ञाने घटनिष्ठप्रकारत्व-
भूतलनिष्ठविशेष्यत्वयोः वह्निनिष्ठप्रकारत्वपर्वतनिष्ठविशेष्यत्वयोश्च परस्परं
निरूप्यनिरूपकभावः, द्वितीये ज्ञाने च घटनिष्ठप्रकारत्वपर्वतनिष्ठविशे-
ष्यत्वयोः वह्निनिष्ठप्रकारत्वभूतलनिष्ठविशेष्यत्वयोश्च निरूप्यनिरूपक-
भाव इति वैलक्षण्योपपत्तिः।

एवं घटवदभूतलं घटवान् पर्वत इत्यादिसमूहालम्बने घटादिरूपैकप्रकारनिष्ठ-
प्रकारताया अपि भूतलपर्वतादिनिष्ठविशेष्यताभेदेन भेदः, भूतलं घटवत् पटवच्चे-
त्यादिसमूहालम्बने च भूतलाद्येकविशेष्यनिष्ठविशेष्यताया अपि घटपटादिनिष्ठ-
प्रकारताभेदेन भेदश्च स्वीकरणीयः। अन्यथा उभयविशेष्यतानिरूपितत्वस्यैकप्रका-
रतायां उभयप्रकारतानिरूपितत्वस्य चैकविशेष्यतायां स्वीकारे तादृशसमूहाल-
म्बनेऽतिरिक्तविषयतायाः कल्पनप्रसङ्गात्। यतः घटवदभूतलम् इति पटवदभू-
तलमिति च प्रत्येकज्ञानीया विशेष्यता प्रकारता च भिन्नैव, उक्तसमूहालम्बनज्ञानीया

तु अतथाभूतेति। मम मते तु घटवद् भूतलमित्याद्याकारकप्रत्येकज्ञाननिरूपिताभ्यां प्रत्येकविशेष्यतानिरूपितप्रकारताभ्यां प्रत्येकप्रकारतानिरूपितविशेष्यताभ्यामेवोपपत्तेः।

प्रकारत्वलक्षणम्

“तत्र तस्य प्रकारत्वं तत्र भासमानवैशिष्ट्यप्रतियोगित्वम्” इति प्रामाण्यवादे दीधितिः। भासमानं यत् तन्निष्ठं वैशिष्ट्यं तत्प्रतियोगित्वमर्थः। अत्र वैशिष्ट्ये तत्रेत्यस्यान्वयोऽभिमतः। वैशिष्ट्ये भासमानत्वविशेषणात् पुरुष इत्यादिज्ञाने स्वरूपसत्पुरुषादिनिष्ठवैशिष्ट्यप्रतियोगित्वमादाय न दण्डादेः प्रकारता। तत्पदार्थेऽपि भासमानत्वं निवेश्यम्। अन्यथा घटो द्रव्यमित्यादौ घटादाविव पटादावपि द्रव्यत्वादेः प्रकारतापत्तेः। प्रतियोगित्वमपि भासमानत्वेन विशेषणीयम्। अन्यथा दण्डपुरुषसंयोगा इत्यादौ दण्डादेः प्रकारतापत्तेः।

न चैवं वैशिष्ट्ये भासमानत्वविशेषणं व्यर्थम्। पुरुष इत्यादिज्ञाने दण्डस्य स्वरूपसत्पुरुषनिष्ठवैशिष्ट्यप्रतियोगित्वमादाय प्रकारत्वापत्तेः प्रतियोगित्वे भासमानत्वविशेषणादेव वारणसंभवात्। तस्मिन् ज्ञाने दण्डनिष्ठप्रतियोगित्वस्याभानादिति वाच्यम्।

प्रतियोगी दण्डः पुरुषश्चेत्यादिज्ञाने दण्डस्य प्रकारतावारणाय वैशिष्ट्ये भासमानत्वविशेषणस्यावश्यकत्वात्।

न चैवमपि संयोगप्रतियोगी दण्डः पुरुषश्चेत्यादौ दण्डादेः प्रकारत्वापत्तिः, भासमानं यत् संयोगरूपं वैशिष्ट्यं तदीयभासमानप्रतियोगित्वस्य दण्डे सत्त्वादिति वाच्यम्। स्वविषयतद्धर्मिनिष्ठं यत् संसर्गविधया स्वविषयीभूतं वैशिष्ट्यं तदीय-संसर्गविधया स्वविषयीभूतं यत् तदीयप्रतियोगित्वं तदेव स्वीयं तद्धर्म्यंशे प्रकारत्वमिति विवक्षणेनादोषात्। संयोगप्रतियोगी दण्डः पुरुषश्चेति ज्ञाने संयोगस्य प्रतियोगित्वस्य च प्रकारविधया भासमानत्वेन संसर्गविधया विषयत्वाभावात्। प्रतियोगितासंबन्धेन पुरुषनिष्ठसंयोगप्रकारकदण्डविशेष्यकज्ञाने संयोगी दण्डः इत्याकारके दण्डस्य प्रकारतावारणाय वैशिष्ट्ये संसर्गविधया स्वविषयीभूतमिति विशेषणम्। स्वनिष्ठसंयोगप्रतियोगित्वसंबन्धेन पुरुषप्रकारकदण्डविशेष्यकज्ञाने पुरुषे दण्ड इत्याकारके दण्डस्य प्रकारत्वापत्तिः, संसर्गविधया विषयीभूतं यत् वैशिष्ट्यं तत्प्रतियोगित्वस्य दण्डे सत्त्वात्। अतस्तद्वारणाय प्रतियोगित्वे संसर्गविधया विषयत्वनिवेशनम्। उक्तपरम्परासंबन्धावगाहिज्ञाने संसर्गतया

भासमानस्य वैशिष्ट्यस्य संसर्गतया न प्रतियोगित्वभानमिति नातिप्रसङ्ग इति गदाधरभट्टाचार्यैः न्यरूपि।

विशेष्यत्वं प्रकारत्वं च द्विविधम् — किञ्चिद्धर्मावच्छिन्नं निरवच्छिन्नं च। तत्र किञ्चिद्धर्मावच्छिन्नविशेष्यता भूतलत्वाद्येकविशेषणविशिष्टे घटादिरूपापरधर्मावगाहिज्ञाने, तत्र घटादिप्रकारतानिरूपितभूतलविशेष्यतायाः भूतलत्वावच्छिन्नत्वात्। न च तत्र विशेष्यतायाः भूतलत्वानवच्छिन्नत्वे का क्षतिरिति वाच्यम्। एकत्र द्वयमिति रीत्या भूतले भूतलत्वं घटत्वं चावगाहमानात् भूतलं घटवदिति ज्ञानात् भूतलत्वविशिष्टे घटवैशिष्ट्यावगाहितादृशज्ञानस्य वैलक्षण्यार्थमेव तथा स्वीकारात्।

किञ्चिद्धर्मावच्छिन्नप्रकारत्वं च घटत्वादिविशिष्टघटवैशिष्ट्यावगाहिनि भूतलं घटवदित्यादिज्ञाने। तत्र घटादिप्रकारतायाः घटत्वाद्यवच्छिन्नत्वात्। अन्यथा केवलं विशेष्ये विशेषणं तत्र च विशेषणान्तरमिति रीत्या घटघटत्वाद्यवगाहिनः तथाविधज्ञानात् विशिष्टवैशिष्ट्यबोधस्य वैलक्षण्यानुपपत्तिः।

अवच्छेदकत्वमपि द्विविधं सावच्छिन्नं निरवच्छिन्नं च। तत्र सावच्छिन्नमवच्छेदकत्वं जातिमत् घटवदित्यादौ। तत्र भूतलत्वनिष्ठायाः विशेष्यतावच्छेदकतायाः जातित्वावच्छिन्नत्वात्। निरवच्छिन्नमवच्छेदकत्वं तु भूतलं घटवदित्यादौ। तत्र भूतलत्वनिष्ठायाः विशेष्यतावच्छेदकतायाः निरवच्छिन्नत्वात्।

विषयतात्वम्

विषयतावत् विशेष्यताप्रकारताभेदेनानुगतानां विषयतानामनुगमकं विषयतात्वमपि अतिरिक्तम्। अन्यथा घटो ज्ञानविषयः पटो ज्ञानविषय इत्याकारिकाया अनुगताकारप्रतीतेरनुपपत्तेः। घटत्वादिविशिष्टविषयकबुद्धित्वावच्छिन्नं प्रति घटत्वादिविषयकज्ञानत्वादिना हेतुत्वानुपपत्तेः। घटत्वाद्येकैकवृत्तिविषयतानामेव प्रकारताविशेष्यताभेदेन नानाविधतया कारणतावच्छेदकभेदेन व्यभिचारप्रसङ्गात्।

एकस्या एव विषयतायाः प्रकारतात्वं विशेष्यतात्वं च स्वीक्रियते। अतः प्रकारतात्वविशेष्यतात्वयोर्न विरोधः। घटवदभूतलमित्यादिज्ञाने घटत्वनिष्ठप्रकारतानिरूपितघटनिष्ठविशेष्यतायाः भूतलनिष्ठविशेष्यतानिरूपितप्रकारतारूपतया तत्र प्रकारतात्वविशेष्यतात्वयोः समावेशात्।

न च घटत्वनिष्ठप्रकारतानिरूपितघटनिष्ठविशेष्यता अन्या भूतलनिष्ठविशेष्यतानिरूपितघटनिष्ठप्रकारता अन्येत्येवास्तु, किं तयोरभेदाभ्युपगमेनेति वाच्यम्।

तत्र तादृशप्रकारताविशेष्यतयोर्भेदे 'घटवदभूतलं द्रव्यं च, द्रव्यवदभूतलं घटश्च' इति ज्ञानयोर्वैलक्षण्यानुपपत्तेः। उभयत्रैव घटत्वप्रकारतानिरूपिताया द्रव्यत्वप्रकारतानिरूपिताया एव घटविशेष्यतायाः घटप्रकारतानिरूपितभूतल-विशेष्यतायाश्च सत्त्वात्। मम मते तु प्रथमे घटत्वप्रकारतानिरूपिता घटविशेष्यता भूतलनिष्ठविशेष्यतानिरूपितप्रकारत्वाभिन्ना, द्रव्यत्वप्रकारतानिरूपितविशेष्यता च तदभिन्ना, द्वितीये द्रव्यत्वप्रकारतानिरूपितघटविशेष्यता भूतलविशेष्यतानिरूपित-प्रकारत्वाभिन्ना, घटत्वप्रकारतानिरूपितविशेष्यता च तदिभन्नेति वैलक्षण्योपपत्तेः।

एवं रक्तदण्डवान् पुरुष इत्याकारकज्ञाने रक्तत्वप्रकारतानिरूपितदण्डत्वाव-च्छिन्नविशेष्यतैव पुरुषनिष्ठविशेष्यतानिरूपितप्रकारतारूपा वक्तव्या। तयोर्भेदे तु 'रक्तो दण्डः दण्डवान् पुरुष' इत्याकारकसमूहालम्बनज्ञानात् रक्तदण्डवान् पुरुष इति विशिष्टबुद्धेर्वैलक्षण्यानुपपत्तेः। उभयत्रैव रक्तत्वप्रकारतानिरूपित-दण्डविशेष्यतायाः दण्डनिष्ठप्रकारतानिरूपितपुरुषविशेष्यतायाश्च सत्त्वादिति।

उद्देश्यता विधेयता च

केचित्तु विशेष्यताप्रकारतावत् उद्देश्यताविधेयते अपि विषयताविशेषौ। न च किञ्चिद्धर्मावच्छिन्नविशेष्यमेवोद्देश्यत्वम्, किञ्चिद्धर्मावच्छिन्नविशेष्यतानिरूपितप्रकारत्वमेव विधेयत्वमस्तु, किं तयोरतिरिक्तत्वस्वीकारेणेति वाच्यम्। तथा सति वह्निमान् पर्वतो घटवानित्यनुमितेः वह्निनिष्ठविधेयताकत्वापत्तिः। पर्वतत्वा-वच्छिन्नविशेष्यतानिरूपितप्रकारतायाः वह्निनिष्ठायाः विधेयतारूपत्वात्। एवं च तदनन्तरं पर्वते वह्निमनुमिनोमीत्यनुव्यवसायापत्तिः। मन्मते तु तादृशज्ञानव्या-वृत्तायाः पर्वतनिष्ठविशेष्यतानिरूपितप्रकारताविलक्षणायाः पर्वतनिष्ठोद्देश्यता-निरूपितवह्निनिष्ठविधेयताया एव तादृशानुव्यवसायविषयत्वाभ्युपगमात् तत्र तदभावादेव तादृशानुव्यवसायापत्त्यसंभवात्।

किं चातिरिक्तायाः विधेयताया अनङ्गीकारे वह्निं नानुमिनोतीति प्रतीतेरनु-मितिनिष्ठो वह्निप्रकारकत्वाभाव आत्मनिष्ठो वह्निप्रकारकानुमितित्वावच्छिन्ना-भावो वा विषयो वाच्यः। तथा च वह्निमान् पर्वतो घटवान्, वह्निमत्पर्वतवान् देश इत्याद्यनुमितिकाले 'वह्निं नानुमिनोति' इति प्रतीतेरनुदयप्रसङ्गः, तादृशानुमितौ वह्निप्रकारकत्वाभावस्य आत्मनि च वह्निप्रकारकानुमितित्वावच्छिन्नाभावस्य असत्त्वात्। विधेयत्वस्यातिरिक्तत्वे तु अनुमितौ वह्निविधेयकत्वाभावस्य, आत्मनि वह्निविधेयकानुमितित्वावच्छिन्नाभावस्य तादृशप्रतीतिविषयत्वोपगमेन नानु-पपत्तिः।

अधैयार्थः विधेयत्वोक्तिरिति वक्तिगारश्च । उद्देश्यत्वं तु विशेष्यस्वरूपमेवास्ति इति चेत् भैक्षम् । उद्देश्यत्वात् विधेयत्वात् पक्षे पर्वति धर्मेति चेत् बाध्यजनशाब्दबोधस्य पर्वतोद्देश्यकत्वानुपपत्तिः । न च तत्र बाध्यैव पर्वतव्यवहारोद्देश्यविधेयभावः, किं तु विशेष्यस्य नापेक्षेयत्वम् । विशेषणस्य पर्वतवृत्तित्वस्य विधेयत्वमिति वाच्यम् । शाब्दबोधस्य च प्राज्ञनिर्दिष्टस्य बोधेन धर्माधर्मनिर्दिष्टपदार्थस्यैव विधेयतया तादृशबाध्यजन्यशाब्दबोधे बहिर्निरुद्देश्यः पर्वतवृत्तित्वं विधेयम् इत्यनुपपत्तेः ।

एवं विधेयत्वादीनां प्रकारताविशेषादिरूपत्वे इतत्त्वव्यापकीभूताभावप्रतियोगिमती पृथिवीत्याकारकपरामर्शिन्यायाः पृथिव्यामंतरभेदः इत्याकारिकाया अप्रसिद्धसाध्यविशेष्यकानुमितेः इतरभेदविधेयकत्वानुपपत्तिः, प्रकारतारूपविषयताया इतरभेदे विरहात् ।

संसर्गता

विशेष्यताप्रकारतावत् संसर्गत्वस्यापि विषयताविशेषात्मकत्वात् संसर्गस्यापि विशिष्टधीविषयत्वमङ्गीकार्यम् । केचित्तु संसर्गस्य विशिष्टधीविषयत्वे मानाभावः । घट इत्यादिज्ञानानन्तरं समवायं जानामीत्याद्याकारकानुव्यवसायस्य सिद्धत्वात्, तादृशानुव्यवसायस्य समवायत्वविशिष्टवैशिष्ट्यावगाहितया समवायत्वप्रकारकज्ञानानन्तरमेव तत्संभवात् ।

वस्तुतस्तु विशिष्टबुद्धेः संसर्गानवगाहित्वे बाधबुद्धिप्रतिबन्धकतायाः संसर्गविशेषनियन्त्रितत्वासंभवात् कपालधर्मिकसंयोगसंबन्धावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकघटाभाववत्तानिश्चयस्य समानधर्मितावच्छेदकं किञ्चिदेव घटादिप्रकारकं ज्ञानं प्रतिबध्यं न तु सर्वम् इत्यनुभवविरोधः ।

संसर्गताया च समं प्रकारतायाः विशेष्यतायाश्च निरूप्यनिरूपकभावाख्यः संबन्धविशेषोऽभ्युपगन्तव्यः । स च संबन्धः कार्यत्वकारणत्वाधेयत्वाधारत्वप्रतियोगित्वानुयोगित्वादीनां मिथस्तादृशसंबन्ध इव स्वरूपविशेषः पदार्थान्तरमेव वा । अन्यथा तत्र तेन संबन्धेन तत्प्रकारकमित्येतदर्थस्य दुर्वचत्वात् ।

न च तत्संसर्गकत्वे सति तन्निष्ठविशेष्यतानिरूपिततत्प्रकारताकत्वमेव तत्र तेन संबन्धेन तत्प्रकारकत्वमिति वाच्यम् । तथा सति भूतलादौ संयोगेन घटादिकं समवायेन च रूपादिकमवगाहमानायाः धियो भूतलांशे संयोगेन रूपादिप्रकारकत्वस्य, समवायेन च घटादिप्रकारकत्वस्य आपत्तेः । एवं समवायेन कपालांशे संयोगेन च भूतलांशे घटमवगाहमानायाः बुद्धेः समवायेन भूतलांशे संयोगेन च कपालांशे घटप्रकारकत्वापत्तेः । संसर्गतायाः प्रकारतया विशेष्यतया

य समं निरूप्यनिरूपकभावान्बोद्धव्यं किंच यत्तन्निर्दिष्टविशेष्यतादिरूपितत्वादीयसंसर्गता
निरूपिता या तदीयप्रकारता तन्निरूपकत्वमेव तदशे तेन संबन्धेन तत्प्रकारकत्वम् ।
यस्य यः संबन्धो यत्र भासते तदीयविशेष्यतातदीयप्रकारताभ्यामेव तदीयसंसर्गताया
निरूप्यनिरूपकभावान्बोद्धव्यं तत्प्रसङ्गः ।

न च प्रकारतायाः संसर्गविशेषावच्छिन्नतया तत्संसर्गवाच्छिन्नतदीयप्रकारता-
निरूपिततदीयविशेष्यताकत्वमेव तेन संबन्धेन तदंशे तत्प्रकारकत्वमस्तु, किमुक्त-
निरूप्यनिरूपकभावोपगमेनेति वाच्यम्। संसर्गनिष्ठावच्छेदकतानिरूपकत्वरूपस्य
संसर्गविच्छिन्नत्वस्य प्रकारतायां स्वीकारे संसर्गताप्रकारतयोर्निरूप्यनिरूपक-
भावस्य सिद्धेः संसर्गनिष्ठावच्छेदकतायाः संसर्गतारूपत्वात्।

न चैवमपि प्रकारतयैव समं संसर्गतायाः निरूप्यनिरूपकभावोऽस्तु, न तु विशेष्यतयापि समम्। पूर्वोक्तबुद्धिनिरूपितायाः समवायनिष्ठसंसर्गतानिरूपितघट-प्रकारताया भूतलनिष्ठविशेष्यतानिरूपितत्वविरहात्, संयोगनिष्ठसंसर्गतानिरूपित-घटप्रकारतायाश्च कपालनिष्ठविशेष्यतानिरूपितत्वविरहात् उक्तातिप्रसङ्गवारणा-दिति वाच्यम्। विनिगमनाविरहेणैव विशेष्यतयापि समं तस्या निरूप्यनिरूपक-भावसिद्धेर्निष्प्रत्युहत्वादिति।

एवं च विशेष्यताप्रकारतयोः साश्चान्निरूप्यनिरूपकभावो नास्ति। किं तु प्रकारतायां विशेष्यतानिरूपितसंसर्गतानिरूपितत्वमेव विशेष्यतानिरूपितत्वम्। विशेष्यतायां प्रकारतानिरूपितसंसर्गतानिरूपितत्वमेव च प्रकारतानिरूपितत्वम्।

एतावता प्रकारता-विशेष्यता-संसर्गतादयः अतिरिक्ताः पदार्थाः। तेषां च परस्परं निरूप्यनिरूपकभावः स्वीकरणीयः इति सिद्धम्।

अवच्छेदकत्वम्

अथ अवच्छेदकत्वं निरूप्यते। प्रतियोगितावच्छेदकं कारणतावच्छेदकमित्यादौ अवच्छेदकत्वं द्विविधम् स्वरूपसंबन्धरूपम् अनतिरिक्तवृत्तित्वरूपं च। अन्यूनानतिप्रसक्तधर्मस्यैव स्वरूपसंबन्धरूपमवच्छेदकत्वं स्वीक्रियते। स्वरूपसंबन्धरूपमवच्छेदकत्वं गुरुधर्मसमनियतलघुधर्मस्यैव न तु गुरुधर्मस्येति नियमः। यथा कम्बुग्रीवादिमान्नास्तीत्यादौ कम्बुग्रीवादिमत्वं नाभावप्रतियोगितावच्छेदकम्, तस्य स्वसमनियतधटत्वापेक्षया गुरुत्वात्। ज्ञानविषयतावच्छेदकत्वं तु गुरोः अतिप्रसक्तस्य न्यूनवृत्तेरपि धर्मस्य भवति। व्यधिकरणधर्मस्यापि भ्रमीयविषयतावच्छेदकत्वात्।

ननु प्रतियोग्यवच्छेदकं, कारणावच्छेदकम् इत्यादिरीत्यैव व्यवहियताम्। प्रतियोगितावच्छेदकं, विषयतावच्छेदकम् इत्यादिरीत्या कुतो व्यवहियत इति चेत् -- श्रूयताम्। घटो नास्ति पटो नास्तीत्यादौ प्रतियोगिविशेषणतापन्नस्य घटत्वादेः प्रतियोगितावच्छेदकत्वमिष्यते। अग्रे वृक्षः कपिसंयोगी न मूले इत्यादिसप्तम्यन्तोल्लेखिप्रतीत्या अग्रस्य कपिसंयोगावच्छेदकत्वं, मूलस्य कपि-संयोगाभावावच्छेदकत्वं चावगाह्यते। अत्र अग्रं कपिसंयोगाभावप्रतियोगिनः कपिसंयोगस्यावच्छेदकम्। एतादृशस्थले प्रतियोग्यवच्छेदकमिति व्यवहियते। घटो नास्तीत्यादौ घटत्वादिकं प्रतियोगितावच्छेदकमिति व्यवहियते। सप्तम्यन्त-निर्दिश्यमानगतावच्छेदकत्वापेक्षया प्रथमान्तनिर्दिश्यमानेषु यत् अवच्छेदकत्वं तद्विलक्षणमिति सूचयितुं तथा व्यवहार इति ॥

REVIEWS

EPIC AND PURANIC BIBLIOGRAPHY (up to 1985) annotated and with indexes. Compiled under the chairmanship of Heinrich von Stietencron by P. Flamm, et. al., ed. by H.v. Stietencron, K.-P. Giety, et. al. PART I: A-R, pp. LX+1-1052; PART II: S-Z; INDEXES, pp. 1053-2116. Published by Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden (Germany), 1992. Purāṇa Research Publications Tübingen, vol. 3, pts. 1-2.

The present work under review is a new mile stone in the bibliographic studies in Indian studies. This well organized and aesthetically brought out *Epic and Purāṇic Bibliography* contains 8168 titles of which 5578 are annotated covering most of the primary and secondary publications on the epics and purāṇas up to 1985. "This bibliography

often contains notes referring to major subjects, view points, methods and results;

has a detailed subject index drawn from titles and annotations; includes references to the Sanskrit passages quoted in the annotated titles plus an index of these references;

has an index to authors, co-authors, editors, translators, and reviewers, and names of persons mentioned; and

gives an index of anthologies and journals used as sources. Bibliographical information about the journals it contained in the list of Abbreviations c): List of journals." (p.VIII).

The book consists of two parts; part 1: the bibliography and part 2: the indexes. It is through the indexes the reader will be

able to reach the required bibliographical data. This bibliography provides information on cosmology, cosmography, heroic tradition, religion and philosophy, sacred places of pilgrimage, legends, mythologies, stotras, epics, morals and codes of conduct, names of epic and purāṇic personages, methodological approaches in modern research along with the names of modern scholars. Secondary literature was collected in Western languages like English, French, German, Italian and Dutch. Secondary literature in modern Indian languages was not collected, which of course is a task to be taken up by Indian institutions on the same lines.

This bibliography is prepared by the Tübingen Purāṇa project at the Seminar für Indologie and Vergleichende Religionswissenschaft of the University of Tübingen. It is compiled by P. Flamm, H.v. Stietencron, et al., and edited by H.v. Stietencron, K.-P. Gietz et al., all of whom deserve hearty approbation for their team work and dedication.

* * * * *

KING ŚŪDRAKA AND HIS DRAMA [by] Biswanath Banerjee, CESMEO, Torino, Italy 1994. Collana di Studi Orientali del Cesmeo diretta da Irma Piovano V. Pp. 215. Price £35.000/ \$ 25.

Every drama, nay every literary composition, irrespective of the theme, should aim, if it has to survive the test of time, at instructing the literati and the common man the social norms of life so as to reach the social values. The social norms change time and again commensurating with the growth of civilization. Thus when the themes are taken from the mythology, the playwright or the poet has limitations in bringing down the mythical heroes and heroines to the contemporary level, even though the composition is quickly accepted. On the other hand the social theme drawn from the contemporary society cannot easily be accepted by the spectators or readers and hence it remains as a challenge for the composer. The contemporaneity of the heroes, heroines, situations and narration make the composer more a social reformer than a man of letters. Hence the drama with a contemporary social theme is considered as a separate category with as many as 10 acts and as many characters as possible speaking different dialects of the country. It is called *prakaraṇa*.

Śūdraka's *Mṛcchakaṭika* is a *prakaraṇa* type of drama, perhaps it is the earliest social play based on the love between a poverty stricken rich brahmin Cārudatta and love-lorn harlot Vasantasenā, who face dichotomy of past and present events. A conflict between ethics and laws of the drama generate a new sense of feeling for introspection into one's own life by the spectators. Thus the *Mṛcchakaṭika* is a great product of Indian cynicism. Hence it attracted the attention of the western connoisseurs more than the natives.

Biswanath Banerjee has shown in his monograph that a criticism should also have a different style and form, so as to give greater room for the readers to judge themselves the literary merit. In three Appendixes he gave the lists of a) verses and b) prose passages - which serve as ethical norms, and c) the choosy words of the playwright, whose derivative senses stand testimony for author's unmatched diction. For example Banerjee explains the word *atithi*, in conformity with the *Manusmṛti* III.102, as 'one who does not stay for a second day at another's place' (p.197). A particular type of cloud is called *droṇa-megha* for the showers of which produce crops plenty. *Droṇa* is an unit of measurement of quantity of the agricultural product like paddy. The unit of measurement of product is metaphorically used for the cloud, the cause.

Banerjee draws the attention of the Indian readers how the *Mṛcchakaṭikam* stands in the eye of western critics, besides demonstrating Śūdraka's satiric views holding up vice or folly to reprobation regarding profession and administrative position. Thus a careful reader does not fail to find freshness in Banerjee's literary criticism, for which he deserves to be approbated heartily.

* * * * *

LOTUS (in thought, legend and culture) [by] D. Diptivilasa. Chandrika Prakashan, 18-3-56A, Shanti Nagar, K.T. Road, Tirupati. Pp. vi+102. Price: Rs. 100=00.

Diptivilasa in his *Lotus* has once again deduced that the Hindu religious tradition is characterized by expansion through modification, absorption and assimilation of beliefs, customs, religious practices and philosophical speculations. Symbolism is resorted

to synthesize the mundane, psychical and spiritual aspirations. Lotus is a symbol of water; hence where water is to be offered, as in the Vaikhāṇasa Āgama tradition, lotus is offered in the fire. The Buddhism and the Jainism are as much Indian as the Vedism, save that the former two do not admit sacrifice as the *summum bonum* or the sacrificial literature as the final. Hence the core religio-philosophical concepts remain the same in Indian mythology. Air, water and fire are the three basic conductors or transformers of energy and hence the oblations to the gods can be made in any of them with varied permutations and combinations. Along with the growth of Sāṃkhya system, the colour of the lotus also played an important role in different ways.

Diptivilasa has laboured splendidly to show how the lotus is being represented in the Vedic and non-Vedic religions and arts. Association of lotus not only as a seat but also as an architectural and sculptural symbol of the gods and goddesses is very well known. All the gods and goddesses are associated with lotus either as a seat or as an ornament of symbolic distinction. In this book the possible religio-philosophical symbolism is also explained. One may even add, following suit, many more interpretations; for, the elasticity of the Vedic tradition is infinite. The strong point in the present book is that the documentary descriptions in epigraphs and literature are corroborated by architectural evidences.

* * * * *

POST INDEPENDENCE DOOTA KAVYAS [by] S. Ranganath.
Department of Sanskrit, N.M.K.R.V. College for women, Jayanagar, Bangalore-560 011. 1994. Pp. 10+90. Price: Rs. 40=00.

CONTRIBUTION OF WOMEN TO POST INDEPENDENCE
SANSKRIT LITERATURE [by] S. Ranganath. Bangalore, 1995.
Pp. 10+57. Price: Rs. 60=00.

The above two monographs form part of the research project of 'Post Independence Sanskrit literature' of the enthusiastic young Sanskritist S. Ranganath. Even though the survey is neither comprehensive nor systematic, the two books unfailingly prove the continued interest among Sanskrit scholars to retain not only the literary flare but also zeal in composing all forms of literature in

Sanskrit. A comprehensive survey would be of much use; but several books published in our country very often do not reach the public libraries for which some concerted effort is to be made.

The *Post Independence Dootakavyas* introduces 9 poems composed after 1952. The *dūtakāvyas* by all means show cultural unity against geographical diversity. Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* is the model for all the poems of this genre. There are some poems of different sentiments other than love-in-separation. For example the *Bhāratasaṃdeśa* of Shivaprasad Bharadhwaj (1963) is a message to the people about the dangers of organizing parties, producing deadly weapons, etc., and need for international peace. Ranganath has given verses with translation from the *Śukasamdeśa* of K.S. Ramanujacharya (1952), the *Bhāratasaṃdeśa* of Shivaprasad Bharadhwaj (1963), the *Plavaṅgadūtam* of Vaneshwar Pathak (1975), the *Mayūradūtam* of P.K. Narayana Pillai (1984), the *Śrīhanūmadūtam* of Hari Narayan Dixit (1987), the *Mṛgāṅkadūtam* of Abhiraj Rajendra Mishra (1987), the *Indusamdeśam* of Chintalavati Viranilakanta Kutumbarama Sastri (1990), the *Dākṣiṇātya-meghasaṃdeśakāvyam* of Veluri Subba Rao (1990) and the *Kāmadūtam* of Ramachandra Shandilya (1990).

The *Contribution of Women to Post Independence Sanskrit Literature* is an assessment by Ranganath of the role of women in enriching the Sanskrit literature during the latter half of the present century with the illustration of six works of women writers. This monograph also demonstrates how the post-independence India has given greater freedom and encouragement to the education and cause of women. The themes of the six poems are of socio-religious value.

Ms. Pandita Kshama Rao's poem *Śrī-Tukārāmacharitam* (1950) describes the life and teachings of the saint poet Tukārām in nine cantos. Ms. Vanamala Bhavalkar's drama *Rāmavanāgamanam* (1965) describes the immigration of Rāma into the forest from Ayodhyā in three scenes. Ms. Nalini Shukla's *Bhāvāñjaliḥ* (1977) is a collection of stotras. Ms. Pushpa Trivedi's poem *Agnishikhā* (1984) describes the feelings of the poetess regarding love in separation. Ms. Uma Deshpandey's *Archanam* (1992) is a collection of short poems describing the glory of Indian culture. Ms. Leela Rao

Dayalus's *Balavidhava* (1993) is an one act play decrying the anti-social practice of child marriage with contemporary characters.

Ranganath deserves appreciation for his zeal to give an account of the on-going literary activities from different points of view. Had he followed the well accepted transliteration system and evolved a style in presentation the work would have become more in tune with modern research methodology.

*

*

*

*

*

VEDIC NIGHAṆṬU (The Oldest Indian Treatise on Etymology) - A CRITICAL STUDY by G.N. Bhat. Pub. by Ayurveda Bhushan M.V. Shastri Memorial Chair, Mangalore University, Konaje-574 199. Pp. 198.

Synonymy and homonymy confront from time immemorial the interpreters of any given text, more so in the case of the Vedic texts which became 'cant' very early of their origin, for being closely associated with ritual and religion. This gave rise in the Vedic Sanskrit to the class of literature called *Nighaṇṭu* 'lexicon of homonyms and synonyms'. Thus every word found in the *Nighaṇṭu* should have been found in some extant or extinct text. *Nirukta* is an applied science of semantics in which the meanings given in the lexicon are derived with illustrations by assigning segmental meanings to different elements called 'morphemes'. A historical study of the *Nighaṇṭu* and the *Nirukta* show not only the expansion of semantic fields but also the civilization of the community. The *Nighaṇṭu* attached to the *Nirukta*, the *Kautsavya-nighaṇṭu* are a few extant examples of this genre.

Gopalakrishna N. Bhat has tried to trace the words of the *Nighaṇṭu* in the *Ṛgveda* and determine their meanings on the basis of Yāska's *Nirukta* and Sāyaṇa's *Bhāṣya*. The dissertation also confirms that the *Ṛgveda* as commented upon by Sāyaṇa is one of the versions of it; for, several words in the *Nighaṇṭu* are not found in this *Ṛgveda* version on the one hand and even some of those found do not fit in the senses of the *Nighaṇṭu*. Paul Theme also proved in his *Pāṇini and the Veda* that the Vedic words derived by Pāṇini do not tally with any extant Vedic recension in full. Thus the Vedic tradition, as said by Patañjali in his *Mahābhāṣya*, is too vast.

Similarly there could be many *Nighaṇṭus* as said by G.N. Bhat, perhaps one for each Vedic recension like the *Prātiśākhya*s. The investigation also confirms that while the *Nirukta* is exclusively confined to the *Ṛgveda*, its *Nighaṇṭu* is a lexicon covering many more texts. But we do not have adequate information which allows to say precisely about the scope and function of the *Nighaṇṭu*. The present study is very significant throwing open many facts which need further investigations.

*

*

*

*

*

MĪMĀMSĀMAÑJARĪ by R. Thangaswami Sarma. Indian Council of Philosophical Research, New Delhi 2, 1996. Pp. xviii+298. Price: Rs. 375=00.

This is an independent monograph written in Sanskrit in a historical perspective to provide a bird's eye view of the literature and rise and growth of the *Mīmāṃsā* school of philosophy. Thangaswami Sarma has a natural advantage of blending tradition with modernity for being traditional in Sanskrit learning and modern in service in the University of Madras. The work is divided into nine sections called *kusumas* justifying the title *mañjarī*. Falling in line with Dharmarāja Adhvarin's *Vedāntaparibhāṣa*, the author has dealt with various tenets of philosophy, namely, categories and means of valid knowledge, besides literature of the *Mīmāṃsā* school. While delineation of the tenets, the position of the *Mīmāṃsakas* is justified in comparison with Advaitins, and Naiyāyikas. The doctrinal differences between the *Bhāṭṭas* and *Prābhākaras* are also shown with citations from the original sources. Sarma has collected and faithfully presented with necessary authentications several doctrinal and argumentative nuances of the *Mīmāṃsakas* which are known in the main from the *anuvādas* of the philosophers of other schools. Thus this book shall be an indispensable tool for research in Indian philosophy besides a text book for the post-graduate and title courses in Sanskrit.

- M. Srimannarayana Murti

**Statement about ownership and other particulars about
Sri Venkateswara University Oriental Journal**

FORM IV

(See Rule 8)

- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| 1. | Place of publication | Oriental Research Institute
Sri Venkateswara University
Tirupati-517 502
Andhra Pradesh, India |
| 2. | Periodicity of its
publication | Halfyearly |
| 3. | Printer' Name
Nationality
Address | M. Rajendran
Indian
The L.V. Graphics
268, Prakasam Road
Tirupati-517501 |
| 4. | Publisher's Name
Nationality
Address | Dr. M. Srimannarayana Murti
Indian
Professor & Director
Oriental Research Institute
Sri Venkateswara University
Tirupati-517 502 |
| 5. | Editor's Name
Nationality
Address | Dr. M. Srimannarayana Murti
Indian
Professor & Director
Oriental Research Institute
Sri Venkateswara University
Tirupati-517 502 |
| 6. | Name and Address of
individual who owns
the periodical | Sri Venkateswara University
Tirupati-517 502 |

I, M. Srimannarayana Murti, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

M. Srimannarayana Murti

. Publisher

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Dr. Lokesh Chandra | Formerly Member of Parliament
J-22, Hauz Khas Enclave
New Delhi-110 016 |
| Dr. V.C. Narayana Das | Professor of Philosophy
University of Calicut
Calicut University P.O.
Kerala 673 635 |
| Dr. P.V. Parabrahma Sastry | Retired Deputy Director (Epigraphy)
H.No. 2-1-514/A
Nallakunta
Hyderabad-500 044 |
| Dr. K.V. Raghavacharya | Lecturer in Telugu
S.V. Music College
Tirupati-517 502 |
| Dr. C. Rajendran | Professor of Sanskrit
University of Calicut
Calicut University P.O.
Kerala 673635 |
| Dr. N.S. Ramanuja Tatacharya | Honorary Professor
French Institute of Indology
Pondicherry-605001 |
| Dr. Sadashiv A. Dange | Retired R.G. Bhandarkar
Professor of Sanskrit,
University of Bombay
'Girnar', Gokhale Road
Mtlund (E), Bombay-400081 |

Sri D. Satyanarayana

Retired Librarian, Kendriya
Sanskrit Vidyapeetha
Satyasadan, 18-3-56A
Santi Nagar, K.T. Road
Tirupati-517 507

Dr. Satya Pal Narang

Professor & Head
Department of Sanskrit
Delhi University
Delhi-110 007

Dr. Satya Vrat

Lecturer in Sanskrit
7/34, Purani Abadi
Sri Ganganagar
Rajasthan

Sri V. Swaminathan

Retired Principal, Guruvayur
Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha
18-1-46/J-4, Prasanthi Nagar
K.T. Road
Tirupati-517507

Dr. Sudarshana Devi Singhal

J-22, Hauz Khas Enclave
New Delhi-110 016

Dr. K.K.A. Venkatachari

104, T.P. Koil Street
Triplicane
Madras-600 005

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor

Professor M.Srimannarayana Murti

Honorary Referee Members

Professor K. Satchidananda Murty	Sangam Jagarlamudi
Professor N.S. Ramanuja Tatacharya	Pondicherry
Professor G.V. Subrahmanyam	Hyderabad
Professor A.V. Narasimha Murthy	Mysore

STAFF MEMBERS

Dr.M. Srimannarayana Murti	Professor of Sanskrit & Director
Dr.V. Venkatarmana Reddy	Reader
Dr.S.R. Matha	Curator-cum-Librarian
Dr.M. Prabhakara Rao	Research Assistant in Telugu
Sri T. Ananthanarayana	Research Assistant in Sanskrit
Dr.E. Chandramouli	Research Assistant in Telugu
Dr.C.V.S. Subrahmanya Sarma	Research Assistant in Sanskrit
Sri M. Munirathnam	Research Assistant in Sanskrit
Dr. N. Narasimhulu	Research Assistant in Telugu
Dr.T.S.R. Narayanan	Research Assistant in Sanskrit

SRI VENKATESWARA UNIVERSITY ORIENTAL JOURNAL

The Sri Venkateswara University Oriental Research Institute was established in 1939 by Tirumala Tirupati Devasthanams and handed over to the Sri Venkateswara University in 1956. It publishes the half-yearly periodical entitled **Sri Venkateswara University Oriental Journal** with original research papers on language and literature of Sanskrit and Telugu, Linguistics, Indian Philosophy and Religion, Ancient Indian History, Fine Arts and Ancient Indian Science. Learned papers written mainly in English partly in Sanskrit and Telugu are received from eminent scholars for publication in the Journal. The papers sent for publication should not normally be more than 12 typed pages with double space and wide margins. Standard system of transliteration should be followed in reproducing original texts. Contributors are requested to retain one copy with them as the manuscript submitted cannot be returned. Twentyfive off-prints of the published article and one copy of the Journal will be sent to the authors free of cost.

The journal also contains reviews of books on Indology. Two copies of books are to be submitted for review in the Journal.

For further details please write to
The Professor and Director
Oriental Research Institute
Sri Venkateswara Univesity
TIRUPATI-517 502 (A.P.)

